

Modern Philology

VOL. III

January, 1906

No. 3

SHAKSPERE, MARSTON, AND THE MALCONTENT TYPE

I. JAKUES A MALCONTENT

Now that the date of Marston's *Malcontent* has been determined to be the year 1600,¹ a question of interest arises as to another play of that year—registered on August 4th²—Shakspere's *As You Like It*. Is Jaques a recast of the title-hero, Malevole? Jaques, too, is a Malcontent—a melancholy figure conceived in the Elizabethan "humorous" manner, a professional fantastic meditator, a professional cynic and censor. He is the only "humorous" character in the play—practically the only one since *Love's Labor's Lost*³—and in the prominence of this quality, as well as in other respects, he is unlike any character of Shakspere's before or after him.⁴ And he is a figure (and name) utterly unknown to the source from which Shakspere drew his plot, Lodge's novel of *Rosalind*. There is reason, then, in the question we ask, and we shall see that there is reason for not asking the converse of it—is Malevole a recast of Jaques?—instead.

¹ For the evidence the reader is referred to the writer's monograph on *John Webster* (Cambridge, Mass., 1905), pp. 55-60. In chap. iii may be found some account of the Malcontent in revenge plays.

² Arber's *Transcript of the Stationers' Reg.*, III, 36, 37; Furness, *Variorum A. Y. L. I.*, pp. 293, 294.

³ Professor A. H. Thorndike, who has had the kindness to read this article, suggests Don John in *Much Ado* (reg. 1600). He is slightly "humorous," and is melancholy, but is not at all a Malcontent as that character, here defined, is conceived by Marston.

⁴ As in Jonson, his humor is continually being discussed, and (see below) it is at times treated satirically.

The points of similarity between Jaques and Malevole are many. Both appear constantly, not as plain human beings, but as "humorous" Malcontents in their professional garb of cynicism and melancholy: of this, directly or indirectly, they and their interlocutors never fail to remind us. As such, they, like the Fool, hold a privileged position: they are "as free as air, and blow on whom they please." Freest they are with their master the Duke, and he in return is fondest of them;¹ and with the other persons of the drama they are pretty uniformly blunt and cynical, or ironically friendly.² With the Fool, however—Passarello in the *Malcontent* and Touchstone in *As You Like It*—they are on excellent terms. They draw him out, revel in his grotesque wisdom, and eagerly fling it in the face of the more foolish world.³ Their conversation is alike lively, abrupt, fantastically phrased; but both are most at home in the set, isolated speech or soliloquy. Here appear their essentially melancholy and Malcontent bias, their railing at the follies and abuses of society, at classes like courtiers and ladies, and at "the world"⁴ in general, and their contemplation—in picturesque fashion—of the vanity and transitoriness of human pretensions, distinctions, and existence⁵ itself.

There are details which, with the above points, make connection between the plays seem pretty probable. The Duke, Jaques's master, has been deposed, as has Duke Altofront, who is disguised as Malevole; and in the end both come to their own.⁶ Here the only discrepancy lies in the very Shakspearean separation of the disguise-character, or Malcontent, from the true character of the Duke. That, genetically, this disguise is represented by Jaques—Altofront and Malevole, though one person, are, in

¹ Both dukes find him "full of matter:" *A. Y. L. I.*, II, 1, 64-70; II, 5, 33, 34; 7, 1-10; *Malc.* (Bullen), I, 1, 25-42. Both seek him out eagerly when he is absent.

² *A. Y. L. I.*, III, 2, 267 ff., with Orlando; *Malc.*, II, 3, 170 ff., with Mendoza, and generally with the bad characters, as Ferrardo, Maquerelle, and Bilioso.

³ *Malc.*, I, 3, especially ll. 57, 58; *A. Y. L. I.*, II, 6, 12 ff.; III, 3; V, 4, 40 ff.

⁴ "Rail at our mistress, the world;" "O world, most vile;" etc. In Jaques, indeed, the role of cynic and censor is less prominent than in Malevole; yet see II, 1, 50-63; II, 5, 62, 63; II, 7, 59-87; III, 2, 295 f.; etc.

⁵ *Malc.*, II, 3, 191-200; III, 1, 156-70; IV, 2, 25-29; IV, 2, 141-51. Cf. especially the last with "All the world's a stage," etc.; and see *A. Y. L. I.*, II, 7, 12-34.

⁶ So much, of course, is in Lodge's novel.

Marston's hands, almost as separate—becomes circumstantially evident at the end. Like Malevole, after a fashion unique in Shakspeare, and in keeping only with a duke or sovereign, he portions off their lot of weal or woe to the various persons of the drama in one similarly phrased, final speech:

[*To duke*] You to your former honour I bequeath;
 Your patience and virtue well deserves it:
 [*To Orl.*] You to a love that your true faith doth merit:
 [*To Oli.*] You to your land and love and great allies:
 [*To Sil.*] You to a long and well-deserved bed:
 [*To Touch.*] And you to wrangling; for thy loving voyage
 Is but for two months victuall'd. So, to your pleasures:
 I am for other than for dancing measures.

Malevole. You o'er-joy'd spirits, wipe your long-wet eyes.

[*To Pietro and Aurelia.*]
 Hence with this man [*Kicks out Mendoza*]: an eagle takes not flies.
 You to your vows [*To Pietro and Aurelia*]: and thou into the
 suburbs. [*To Maquerelle.*]
 You to my worst friend I would hardly give.
 Thou art a perfect old knave [*To Bilioso*]: all-pleas'd live.
 You two unto my breast [*To Celso and the Captain*]: thou to
 my heart [*To Maria*].
 The rest of idle actors part:
 And as for me, I here assume my right,
 To which I hope all's pleas'd: to all, good-night.

The purport of Jaques's wish—

I must have liberty
 Withal, as large a charter as the wind,
 To blow on whom I please—¹

moreover, is quite that of the character which Pietro gives Malevole,

Now shall you hear the extremity of a malcontent: he is as free as air; he blows on every man;²

and as Jaques continues, in praise of the privileges of motley—

for so fools have;
 And they that are most galled with my folly,
 They most must laugh. And why, sir, must they so?
 The "why" is plain as way to parish church:

¹ *A. Y. L. I., II, 7, 47 ff.*

² *Malc., I, 1, 41, 42.*

He that a fool doth very wisely hit
Doth very foolishly, although he smart,
Not to seem senseless of the bob¹—

his thought is like Malevole's in his self-gratulation on the advantages of his disguise:

Well, this disguise doth yet afford me that
Which kings do seldom hear, or great men use
Free speech: and though my state's usurped,
Yet this affected strain gives me a tongue
As fetterless as is² an emperor's.
I may speak foolishly, ay, knavishly,
Always carelessly, yet no one thinks it fashion
To poise my breath; for he that laughs and strikes
Is lightly felt, or seldom struck again.³

And Touchstone's satirical retort, V, 4, 42-49, being similarly provoked, may possibly be an echo of Malevole's, III, 1, 265-70. All these, together with Jaques's and Malevole's delight in jarring sounds,⁴ which I have not found in the contemporary descriptions of melancholy, and which is inconsistent with Jaques's sucking of melancholy from a song,⁵ are points of contact such as would come about quite naturally from Shakspeare's seeing Marston's play on the boards.

There is, however, a material objection to our theory. Malevole's humor is never once called melancholy, but that of a Malcontent, and Jaques's is always called melancholy. But to the Elizabethan mind the word "malcontent" implied melancholy—denoted, like "cynicism" with us today, an exacerbated form of it. The only proof I have to offer (but, I think, a conclusive one) is a comparison of the characteristics of Malevole with the symptoms of melancholy as given by Burton—collected in 1621, but all of them, being from authorities almost as venerable as Galen, certainly as well known⁶ to any Elizabethan as the symptoms of small-pox or diphtheria to the Englishman of today.

¹ *A. Y. L. I.*, II, 7, 49-55.

² Mr. Bullen reads, by error, "in."

³ *Malc.*, I, 1, 201-9; a similar thought in a similar situation is uttered by Marston's Antonio, *Ant. Rev.*, IV, 1, 1-58.

⁴ See below.

⁵ *A. Y. L. I.*, II, 5, 12-14.

⁶ In English I have found the titles of the following contemporary works: *A Treatise of Melancholie*, by T. Bright, 1586; *Of Melancholic Diseases* (1599); *Melancholike Humours*, by N. Breton, 1600.

. . . . mighty and often watchings, sometimes waking for a month, a year, together. (Burton,¹ vol. i, p. 441.)

. . . . little or no sleep, & that interrupt, terrible & fearful dreams
. . . . absurd & interrupt dreams, & many phantastical visions.
(Pp. 440, 441.)

And although they be commonly lean, hirsute, uncheerful in countenance, withered, and not so pleasant to behold, by reason of those continual fears, griefs, and vexations . . . yet their memories are most part good, they have happy wits, and excellent apprehensions. (P. 441.)

. . . . laughing, grinning, fleering, murmuring, talking to themselves, with strange mouths and faces, inarticulate voices, exclamations, etc.
(P. 441.)

And though they laugh many times, & seem to be extraordinary merry (as they will by fits) yet extreme lumpish again in an instant, dull, & heavy. (P. 447.)

Not affable in speech, or apt to vulgar compliment, but surly, dull, sad, austere. (P. 451.)

If it come from melancholy itself adust, those men, saith Avicenna, are unusually sad and solitary . . . have long, sore, and most corrupt imaginations . . . they dream of graves still, and dead men, etc.
(P. 462.)

. . . . continually meditating. (P. 453.)

. . . . some think they are beasts . . . cry like dogs, foxes, bray like asses, and low like kine. (P. 462.)

. . . . they are still fretting, chafing, sighing, grieving, complaining, finding faults, repining, grudging . . . discontent, either for their own, other men's, or publick affairs, such as concern them not, things past, present, or to come. (P. 448.)

This is melancholy, and such, certainly, is the humor of Malevole. Here are his leanness,² wakefulness,³ and fearful or absurd dreams;⁴ his excellent apprehensions, abrupt changes from sobriety to mirth, and uncouth ejaculations;⁵ his howling like a beast;⁶ his corrupt imaginations and continual meditations; his surliness, his repinings, and his quarrel with the course of the world at large. One other symptom, his love of jarring sounds,⁶ which

¹ Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, ed. by Shilleto, 3 vols. (London, 1896).

² *Malc.*, III, 1, 169.

³ *Ibid.*, III, 1, 157-70; I, 1, 86-100.

⁴ "Yaugh," "um," "god-a-man," "whoop" (Felicie), etc.

⁵ *Malc.*, I, 1, 24, stage direction: "howle againe."

⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 1, first stage direction and ll. 10-12.

reappears in Jaques,¹ is not noticed by Burton—the melancholy are expressly said to be fond of music—and is, I am persuaded, a popular or a Marstonian invention, in keeping poetically rather than physiologically or psychologically; but enough, surely, has already been adduced to show that Malevole's humor is as much that of melancholy as is Jaques's itself.

As always, there are the three alternatives—Marston may be indebted to Shakspeare, Shakspeare to Marston, or both to a common source.

The first alternative is improbable, and for two reasons: the main features of Malevole are all at hand in the Feliche of the First Part of Marston's *Antonio and Mellida*, acted in 1599;² and of the two portrayals of the Malcontent—Jaques and Malevole—the latter is the cruder, the more popular and primitive. As for the one reason, Feliche, like Malevole, is a meditator, a foul-mouthed cynic and censor, whose business is to comment on life, and to rail at vices and affectations, whether before his eyes or abroad on the earth. He enjoys the privilege and license of Malevole, and rails at the duke, the court, and all the world. Like him, he takes now a prophetic, high-flying attitude, and threatens the wrath and thunder of God; now a familiar, ironically friendly

¹ "Here was he merry, hearing of a song.

Duke S. If he, compact of jars, grow musical,
We shall have shortly discord in the spheres."

(*A. Y. L. L.*, II, 7, 4-6.)

In this passage, the reader will observe, the Duke does not exactly say that Jaques delights in discordant sounds, but he does express surprise that Jaques, full of discord within, could delight in harmonious sounds. This seems to indicate an acquaintance on Shakspeare's part with either a popular or the Marstonian notion of a connection between delight in discordant sounds and the temper of a Malcontent. For either notion there is evidence. The *Malcontent* begins with vile out-of-tune music from Malevole's den, and wastes no comment; Malevole, like Shakspeare's Duke, once remarks that "discord to malcontents is very manna," and we can readily see that from metaphor to reality is no far cry. And ten years earlier old Hieronimo, who is several times said to be suffering from "melanchollie," is literal and explicit enough:

"Come in, old man, thou shalt to Izabell;
Leane on my arme: I thee, thou me shalt stay,
And thou and I and she will sing a song,
Three parts in one, but all of discords framed."

(*Sp. Tr.*, III, 13, 169 f.)

Vestiges of this popular notion of a Malcontent, perfectly intelligible to the audience, were, I think, carelessly retained by Shakspeare, though at the risk of contradicting his more sentimental conceptions of a Malcontent.

² *A. & M.*, V, 1, 8: "Anno Domini, 1599."

one, and draws out the fools and ninnies around him.¹ Like him, he is now sad and sour, now boisterously, indecently mirthful. Like him, he is fond of cynical, impudent asides, incisive jests and repartees, fantastic phrases, and uncouth expletives, and gets the name of "good" and "plainspoken." And like him unable to sleep at night, he paces about meditating.² The *Malcontent*, then, as a stage-figure,³ is Marston's independent creation, of which all the main features appear, so early as in 1599, in the first rough draft, *Feliche*⁴—most of the elements of the latter having been drawn, as we are yet to see, from the Kydian *Hamlet* and from the *Macilente* of Jonson.⁵

As to the other reason, we have seen already how much more "humorous" *Malevole* is than *Jaques*—how many more signs of melancholy he bears and how much more glaringly and popularly he is painted. He paces about in sleepless anguish, or dreams bad dreams; he plays the vilest out-of-tune music alone in his den, and snarls and howls as he emerges; he laughs one moment and is sullen the next; he bemoans his fate in resounding verse; he sings questionable songs, frisks about the stage, launches bitter gibes, and utters outlandish ejaculations. He has, moreover, none of the milder, more human symptoms of *Jaques*—also noticed by Burton—the sentimentality, the morbid delight in music and solitariness, the aversion to love matters and pastimes. Picturesque as *Jaques*, his is a louder-mouthed humor, meant to delight the popular Elizabethan heart; it is not psychologized, or tamed and mellowed down within the limits of decency and plausible

¹ He takes a delight in fools that in phrasing recalls that of *Jaques*, though the "fools" are not professional jesters and the delight is purely cynical and ironical, not at all æsthetic. Cf. *A. & M.*, III, 2, 120, 163.

² *A. & M.*, III, 2, 1-24.

³ Not, however, as a character in life. Though the matter has not yet been investigated, there can be no doubt that, partly under the influence of the physiological theories of the day, there arose in early Elizabethan times or earlier a mythology, so to speak, of human character. Monsters came into being in the popular fancy—unreal as the unicorn and chimæra—monsters of the spirit, clothed in human flesh. The *Machiavel*, the *Malcontent*, the "atheist," the "empoisoner," are among them, and are not to be considered as merely the creations of the dramatists.

⁴ Why not *Feliche* instead of *Malevole*, then, as the model for *Jaques*? For two reasons not: at the points shown in the second and third paragraphs of this article *Malevole* bears a likeness to *Jaques* that *Feliche* lacks; and *Malevole* is a far more conspicuous character, in a more striking, generally more influential play.

⁵ See below, pp. 16-20.

humanity.¹ To the author of such a character what could Jaques have been? To the author of Jaques, on the other hand, Malevole might have been what Basilisco was to the author of Falstaff, or what Lyly's "merry servants" were to the author of the Dromios and of Launce and Speed. The relation inverted—the finished, humanly significant Jaques as prototype—would have been an anomaly in the evolution of the drama.

The third alternative—that Shakspeare and Marston drew from a common source—is equally improbable, and thus the second—that Shakspeare drew from Marston—is alone left open. For not only is there no such source now to be found, but, as it appears, there could hardly have ever been one. There are skits at melancholy in the contemporary plays, there are melancholy characters treated satirically,² but those are different matters.³ And the only melancholy characters treated sympathetically, the only characters in function or in temper at all like Malevole, Feliche, or Jaques—the Kydian Hamlet and Macilente—are scarcely like Jaques, and yet are so much like Feliche and Malevole as to be, very certainly, their sources.⁴ How, then, is there place for a common source?

Malevole was not influenced by Jaques, both were not conceivably derived from a common source, and shall we not infer that Jaques was influenced by Malevole? At least—what is almost as interesting—Jaques, born into the world of fancy the same year as Malevole, belongs like him to the Malcontent type, which is a Marstonian creation, and was influenced—directly or indirectly, through Malevole or through Feliche—by Marston.

¹ Cf. the case of Hamlet, below.

² Especially in Jonson's early comedies, *Every Man in His Humour*, *Every Man out of His Humour*, *Cynthia's Revels*, and the *Poetaster*. But even in the Stephen of the first-named play melancholy is no real quality of the character—is only one of his many affected attitudes—and is not at all prominent.

³ Not that Shakspeare himself is not influenced by this point of view. He imparts to Jaques none of that odor of morality which is a bit rank in Malevole—expressly attributes his melancholy to a sated sensuality, and gives it a sentimental cast. And in IV, 1, in the company of Rosalind, he turns him for the moment into a satirical figure—the affected traveler—somewhat in the spirit of Jonson's satire of the contemporary affectation in the person of Stephen and others. But this point of view is different from Shakspeare's prevailing one with Jaques, and from Marston's with Malevole: these are made Malcontents—fantastic meditators, cynics and censors.

⁴ See below, pp. 16-20.

II. HAMLET A MALCONTENT

If *As You Like It* betrays the influence of the *Malcontent* in 1600, what of *Hamlet* in 1601?¹ Hamlet, the hero, is of one family with Jaques and Malevole: he is, in the old sense of the word, melancholy, and he is a cynic. His melancholy and cynicism are less ostentatiously "humorous," yet, both practically and philosophically, alike thoroughgoing. More after Malevole's heart than Jaques himself, he is a professional somber, satirical meditator, who ranges widely from the main dramatic drift, and a mocker and censor of the vice and affectation round about him. Like Malevole and unlike Jaques, he is a revenger lurking at his own ancestral court, protected by the very recklessness and eccentricity of his innuendoes. Like Malevole and unlike Jaques, he is boisterous, uncouth and nonsensical, obscene, and yet is sympathetically treated—as Jaques is not²—as a tragic³ figure. Throughout he is far more like Malevole than like Jaques, and yet, as has been noted by a sound scholar like Professor Herford,⁴ who, we may suppose, had no inkling of the issue we are now raising, he is more like Jaques than any other character in Shakspeare.

That in *Hamlet* Shakspeare was imitating and emulating the revenge plays of Marston (and the *Malcontent* is to be included in their number) appears likely even from external, circumstantial evidence. In the case of *As You Like It* there could be only surmises that Shakspeare was seeking to rival the success of Malevole; here, in the words of the Quarto of 1603, which, though probably garbled and curtailed, we will quote instead of the more famous, possibly later, words of the Folio, there is, at any rate, explicit testimony to a success greater than his own:

¹ See below the registering; scholars seem agreed that *Hamlet* was written no earlier. As to the evidence for the *Malcontent's* being subsequent to *Hamlet*, I have considered, and, I think confuted, it in my *John Webster*, pp. 60, 61. The only point of weight against the date 1600 is the allusion to the Scots. The allusions to *Hamlet* (*illo, ho, ho, etc.*, *Malc.*, III, 1, 250, and I, 1, 350-53; *Ham.*, II, 2, 315 f.) are derived, one from the old *Hamlet*, and the other from the commentators' fancy.

² See, above, traces in Jaques of the influence of Jonson's satirical method.

³ This is a trifle strong for Malevole; but, as is commonly recognized, the play, except for the close, is a revenge tragedy. See below.

⁴ Eversley Shakspeare, viii, pp. 128, 129.

Ross. My Lord, the Tragedians of the Citty

Those you took delight to see so often.

Ham. How comes it that they trauell? Do they grow restie?

Gil. No my lord, their reputation holds as it was wont.

Ham. How then?

Gil. Yfaith my Lord, noueltie carries it away,

For the principall publike audience that

Came to them, are turned to priuate playes,

And to the humour of children. (P. 30.)

The play in which these words are found itself belongs to the same class with what at this time were probably the most popular plays of the children's companies—Marston's two revenge tragedies, *Antonio and Mellida* and *Antonio's Revenge*, played by the "little eyasses" of Paul's, and his revenge comedy, the *Malcontent*, played by the "decimosextos" of Blackfriars. For from other sources we know that from 1599 to 1601 there was great interest, especially at the children's theaters, in revenge plays, and that it was Marston who wrote them. I draw, with some changes, from the evidence collected for another purpose by Professor Thorndike:¹

1. The popularity of plays dealing with ghosts attested by a *Warning for Fair Women*, 1599, by the Chamberlain's Men.
2. *Antonio and Mellida*, 1599, by Paul's Boys.
3. *Antonio's Revenge*, 1599, by Paul's Boys.
4. The *Malcontent*, 1600, by the Children at Blackfriars.²
5. The *Spanish Tragedy*, or "*Jeronimo*," revised for the Chapel Children about 1600.
6. Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois*, 1600, by Paul's Boys.³
7. *Julius Caesar*, containing a revenge element and a ghost, 1600-01, by the Chamberlain's Men.

¹ He gathers evidence for the years 1597-1604, but that for the years 1597-98 amounts to the revival of the old play—yet unaltered—the *Spanish Tragedy*. See *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 1902, pp. 137 ff., "Hamlet and Elizabethan Revenge Plays."

² That it was there and by children (those of her Majesty's Revels, presumably, cf. the title-page of the *Faen*, 1606) that the play was acted, appears from the Induction, written by Webster for the King's (Chamberlain's) Men in 1604. That it was originally written, not for men-players such as the Chamberlain's Company—"who had not the custom of music in their theatre"—but for children, appears from the songs indicated, which in several cases, as I, 1, 40, where one is necessary in order to give Malevole time to go to church and return, prove to be integral portions of the text.

³ The date is determined in an article on the "Dates of Chapman's Plays," *Modern Language Notes*, November, 1905.

8. Three lost plays, possibly revenge plays, written for Henslowe, 1599-1601.

9. The *Spanish Tragedy*, altered by Ben Jonson for Henslowe, 1601-2.

10. Chettle's *Hoffman*, 1602.

11. *Hamlet*, 1601-2, by the Chamberlain's Men.¹

12. The final *Hamlet*, 1603, by the Chamberlain's Men.

From these data it is easy to glean that at the time when Shakspeare turned to *Hamlet*, the time when the stage, as he himself complains, was ruled by Children, it was the Children that led with original revenge plays²—from the pen of Marston—and it is not a precipitate inference that in his own revenge play Shakspeare should be glancing at these.

By the tide of favor which followed the Children and their revenge poet, Shakspeare and his more conservative company were swept along. In their *Warning for Fair Women*, of 1599, the author—Shakspeare, some have thought—ridiculed revenge plays, perhaps in envy of their success:

How some damn'd tyrant to obtain a crown
Stabs, hangs, imprisons, smothers, cutteth throats,
And then a Chorus, too, comes howling in
And tells us of the worrying of a cat:
Then, too, a filthy whining ghost,
Lapt in some foul sheet, or a leather pilch,
Comes screaming like a pig half stick'd,
And cries, *Vindicta!*—Revenge, Revenge!
With that a little rosin flasheth forth³—

In their *Julius Caesar*, of 1600-01, Shakspeare so far conformed as to introduce a "revenge element and a ghost." And by the end of 1601 the company had so fallen in the rear of fashion and favor that he was commissioned to recast a revenge play of their own, once famous but now half forgotten,⁴ from the pen

¹"As yt was latelie acted by the Lord Chamberleyne, his servantes," July 26, 1602.

²To be sure they were playing other notable plays as well, as Jonson's *Cynthia's Revels* (1600) and the *Poetaster* (1601); but the success of these was not such as to lead Shakspeare to imitate them.

³Quoted by Thorndike, p. 121; the play is to be found in Simpson's *School of Shakspeare*.

⁴Acted at Newington Butts in 1594, and at "the Theater" in 1596, when the Chamberlain's Company played there. (Sarrasin, *Kyd und sein Kreis*, p. 104.)

of the father of revenge plays, Kyd.¹ But he did not tinker at it, as Jonson did at the sister-play, the *Spanish Tragedy*. Jonson added only mad-scenes, and those not under Marston's influence; Shakspeare cast his play wholly anew, in a present-day, a somewhat Marstonian, though a finer, mould. Like Marston in *Antonio's Revenge*, though more completely, he replaced the revenger's Senecan commonplaces with new, philosophic meditations;² and like Marston in his revenge comedy, though more delicately, he joined to the revenger some elements at least of a new character—the brooding, jeering Malcontent. With his quick intuition, Shakspeare, as Jonson, Chapman, and Chettle³ nowise did, read the whole decree of popular favor, and in both the letter and the spirit he obeyed.

With the possible influence on *Hamlet* of Marston's revenge tragedies we cannot here concern ourselves—the notable influence is that of the *Malcontent*. This play, as I have elsewhere observed, was highly popular and influential: it determined the later development—in the hands of Tourneur and Webster—of the revenge type; and at an earlier day it influenced at one point the greatest play of the type, as well. That point was the character of the hero. In *Altofront* had appeared, for the first time united in one person, the revenger and the more or less feigned part, or disguise, called the Malcontent; and in *Hamlet* they appear again.⁴

In the present *Hamlet* there are two component elements—the “gentle boy”'s revenger, of Kydian origin, on the one hand, represented by the Kydian *Hamlet*, Marston's *Antonio*, and, less completely, the *Horatio* of the *Spanish Tragedy*; and the Mal-

¹That the old *Hamlet* was by Kyd surely there is now no one left to doubt.

²For this purpose, Shakspeare drew both upon his own stores and upon Montaigne. See in *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, 1902, pp. 312-47, an article by Miss Hooker.

³*Hamlet* has almost no points in common with the “splendid lunacy” of Jonson's enlarged *Hieronimo*, or—except as a revenger, of course—with anything in Chapman or Chettle.

⁴As we shall see, however, only in the matter of the union of revenger and Malcontent can Marston have been an innovator and Shakspeare his imitator. The mere situation of the revenger lurking at his own court in disguise is a reminiscence of *Antonio* disguised at his court as a fool and, finally, of the old *Hamlet* himself.

⁵The phrase, which occurs in *Ant. Rev.* addressed by Andrugio to his son, as in the *Sp. Tr.* addressed by Hieronimo to Horatio, furnishes a convenient label for a type.

content, of Marstonian origin, on the other hand, represented by Feliche and Malevole. As for the one element, Hamlet, as Ophelia laments, was

The expectancy and rose of the fair state,
The glass of fashion and the mould of form
(*Ham.*, III, 1, 160, 161)

or, as the Quarto has it,

the only flour of Denmark (P. 21)

just as the Spanish Horatio was

a mirrour in our daies
(*Sp. Tr.*, III, 8, 22);

but, like still another representative, Antonio, and the revenging father, Hieronimo, he was at the same time a shrinking, high-minded revenger. Such, pre-eminently, was the Kydian Hamlet. Like Antonio and Hieronimo, he was gentle and blameless in thought and deed, except in the matter of a conventional blood-thirstiness and a fierceness against his mother.¹ Like them, he meditated only a revenger's meditations—on justice, his own remissness, suicide, the future life, and the round of Senecan commonplaces. Like them, he was a revenger from first to last, and his pathos and irony were those of other revengers—childishly simple, personal, dramatic,² not contemplative, not philosophic or moral. And this part of Hamlet—his disposition, his deeds, and the bare themes of the revenger's meditations—Shakspeare, after infusing into them the coherence of psychology and the glow of imagination, retained in his play.³

With the Malcontent element it is another matter. This, in rough terms, amounts to his madness—feigned like the disguise Malevole, but, like it, hard at times to separate from the real character underneath. It embraces fairly all of Hamlet that has nothing to do with revenge—the humor of melancholy, the

¹ In the original *Hamlet*, no doubt, the Orestean hero intended to kill his mother, and it was more than a desire to save her feelings that recalled the Ghost. Compare the Queen's words—"thou wilt not murder me?"—the account of rough usage at his hands which she gives to the King in Q I, p. 47, and Antonio's words just before his entirely similar visit to his mother, III, 2, 87, "why lives that mother?"

² As at the play, addressed to the King and Queen, III, 2, 240 ff., and *passim*; *Ant. Rev.*, III, 1, 95, 96, "the good, good prince, my most dear, dear lord;" *Sp. Tr.*, III, 14, 156-61.

³ See Thorndike's article, already cited.

undramatic speculations, as in the graveyard, upon the vanity of human things, a thoroughgoing, sardonic cynicism and skepticism whether in general or in particular—irony of a general moral and satiric significance, on the one hand, and rude, obscene, Diogenic behavior toward women or vicious, affected persons, on the other. All this corresponds to the primitive mock-madness of the Kydian Hamlet, and may have been, as we shall see, a development from it, a substitute, or a little of both.

Some of these marks of the Malcontent are to be considered later; others—the humor of melancholy and all that concerns Hamlet's relations to the other characters of the play—require a word at present.

As for the melancholy, Hamlet's, like Malevole's, is conceived precisely, after Elizabethan fashion, as a malady. It is represented objectively, physiologically—not subjectively, as the unique passion of an individual soul. Though recognized to have possibly a quite personal grief as cause, it manifests only the trite, stereotyped symptoms and effects. As in the case of a true "humor," it is freely spoken of both by himself and by others as "melancholy,"¹ and by himself it is described in round, absolute terms, as if he were giving the symptoms of a fever, and without more knowledge than as in the case of a fever of the cause:²

I have of late—but wherefore I know not—lost all my mirth, forgone all custom of exercises; and indeed it goes so heavily with my disposition that this goodly frame, the earth, seems to me a sterile promontory, this most excellent canopy, the air, look you, this brave o'erhanging firmament, this majestical roof fretted with golden fire, why, it appears no other thing to me than a foul and pestilent congregation of vapours. What a piece of work is man! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculty! in form and moving how express and admirable! in action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals! And yet, to me, what is this quintessence of dust? man delights not me; no, nor woman neither, though by your smiling you seem to say so.³ (*Ham.*, II, 2, 306-23.)

¹ *Ham.*, II, 2, 630; III, 1, 173.

² It matters not to our argument if this be only a blind for Rosencrantz and Guildenstern. Altofront's melancholy, too, is feigned. In Altofront and Hamlet alike, moreover, many feigned qualities are treated at times as real.

³ That neither Hamlet nor Guildenstern and Rosencrantz expressly say that these symptoms mean melancholy does not signify; they and the audience understood, and

Why, we may well wonder, does Hamlet describe his distemper to these spies, whom he has already detected, so unmistakably as melancholy, and not—in a half-mad way—as madness?

In his dealings with the other characters Hamlet, far more than Jaques, is Malevole over again. He is vivacious and abrupt, witty and uncouth, sportively familiar and rude, somber and filthily merry. Some of these qualities—the vivacity, the abruptness, the wit, the sarcasm—need, in either case, no illustration. The uncouth obscurity, which passes in Hamlet for madness and in Malevole for the eccentricity of a Malcontent's humor, and, in the former, for an evident reason, is more pronounced, appears in passages such as these:

Excellent, i' faith; of the chameleon's dish: I eat the air, promise-crammed: you cannot feed capons so. (*Ham.*, III, 2, 98-100.)

The king is a thing of nothing: bring me to him. Hide fox, and all after. (*Ham.*, IV, 2, 31-32.)

. . . or else shall he suffer not thinking on, with the hobby-horse, whose epitaph is For O, for O, the hobby-horse is forgot. (*Ham.*, III, 2, 143 f.)

Pietro. How dost thou live now-a-days, Malevole?

Mal. Why, like the Knight Sir Patrick Penloahans, with killing o' spiders for my lady's monkey. (*Malc.*, I, 1, 84.)

Maquerelle. Will ye help me with a he-fox? Here's the duke.

Mal. Fried frogs are very good, and French-like, too. (*Malc.*, II, 2, 32.)

and in the outlandish expletives of Malevole, and in the doggerel, the snatches of old ballads allusively and derisively used, and the abrupt enigmas and riddles, followed by expository comment, of both.

The sportive familiarity and rudeness, traits not pleasant even in Hamlet, appear in Malevole's and Hamlet's behavior toward dotards like Polonius and Bilioso, or toward affected ninnies like Osric and Balurdo.¹ They attack them with a false friendliness,

as for Shakspeare, he, unlike his predecessors, does not say things out. Neglect of physical exercise, both as a cause and as a symptom, is given by Burton, I, pp. 349, 455; and compare what he has to say of the melancholy man's attitude toward women, p. 452, and of his disgust with company, nature, and life itself, pp. 455, 467, 475-76. It is worthy of note, also, that Hamlet, like Malevole, complains, as a melancholy man, of "bad dreams" (II, 2, 260-62). See the previous section, and the *Malc.*, I, 1, 88 f.

¹ In *A. & M.*, the butt of the Protomalcontent Feliche; in the *Malc.* there is no exact parallel to Osric.

they play the stops of their servility and folly, they jest with them beyond their apprehensions, they twit and mock¹ them, and they jeer at them both openly and in their sleeves. As, in III, 2, 103 ff., and *passim*, Hamlet meets Polonius, he, with far less excuse, shows the same disrespect for age, the same frisky familiarity, and the same disposition to muddle and put to confusion one who has not offended, as does Malevole when he meets Bilioso.²

Of their somberness and obscenity, of their levity in somberness³ and merriment in filth, there need be no illustration. These traits are not contradictory, but symptoms of a burrowing, dissolving turn of mind almost as characteristic of Malevole as of Hamlet. The obscenity, as that form of cynicism and satire most in place, is by both reserved more especially for women. Hamlet's jests and insinuations addressed to Ophelia, alone and still more at the play,⁴ are like nothing in Kyd, seeming, indeed, altogether out of keeping with the character of the "gentle boy,"⁵ and—on a hero's lips for a heroine's ears—are like nothing else in Shakspeare, but are somewhat like Malevole's addressed to Bianca and Maquerelle.⁶

So far so good; but we have yet to reckon with Kyd—his *Hamlet* and its derivatives, the *Fratricide Punished*⁷ and the first Quarto. In Kyd's other works, indeed, the *Spanish Tragedy* and *Soliman and Perseda*⁸—and such evidence is in this case not contemptible, for by reconstruction it is readily seen how in

¹ Hamlet (II, 2, 408 ff., and V, 2, 117 ff.) echoes Polonius and Osric as Feliche does Castilio in III, 2, 31 f., and somewhat as Malevole twits Bilioso.

² Cf. *Malc.*, I, 1, 260 ff.; IV, 2, 125 ff. One of the main subjects of Malevole's jeering conversation with Bilioso is his young wife, as Hamlet's with Polonius is his daughter; and with the wife Malevole's subject is Bilioso, as with the daughter Hamlet's is her father. Both deride their victims' gray hairs and failing bodily and mental powers: *Malc.*, I, 1, 76-80, 255; III, 1, 172-74; IV, 2, 128-31; *Ham.*, II, 2, 198-206, etc.

³ As in the graveyard scene, and when Hamlet reassures the attendants who go to seek Polonius that "he will stay until you come." Malevole *passim*. Cf. the abruptly somber rejoinders when Hamlet replies to Polonius' suggestion to "come out of the air," "into my grave?" and when Malevole, being asked when he shall "rise," replies, "at the resurrection."

⁴ For their full force, to be read in connection with the Quartos.—Cf. last ref. in note 2.

⁵ Smutty as Marston generally is, he makes Antonio in this respect blameless.

⁶ Hamlet's remarks to Ophelia, and to Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, II, 2, 237 f., are of the same ingenious smuttness as Malevole's *passim*, but more especially his to Bianca and Maquerelle, II, 2, and V, 2. Cf. Feliche's on painting, II, 1, 250-53; III, 2, 120-64.

⁷ *Der bestrafte Brudermord*, or *The Fratricide Punished*.

⁸ I am aware that the authorship has been questioned and is not certain.

style, phrase, and plot Kyd only repeated himself—there is no trace of satire, satirist, or satirist's butt, of the humor of melancholy or of the philosophy of it, of the broodings on vanity and decay, or of any other of the notes of the *Malcontent*—vivacity, impudence, uncouth obscurity, or smut. And in his *Hamlet*, written as it was in 1589, and whether before or after the *Spanish Tragedy* only by a year or so,¹ it is probable that the hero, though indulging in personalities, was mad in as simple, primitive, really unsatirical a fashion as Hieronimo, and that the objects of his personalities—Corambis (Polonius) and the "braggart gentleman"² (Osric) were as simply, unsatirically comical as Jeronimo³ and those drolls whose drollery, like Polonius's, was so harshly interrupted by a tragic fate—Piston and Pedringano.⁴ But if it be granted that the Kydian *Hamlet* is the direct and only source, in all their divergences and aberrations, of the *Fratricide Punished* and the first Quarto—and here granted that must be⁵—then it must have contained after all the humor of melancholy, the satirist, and the satirist's butt, at least *in posse*. In the first Quarto, as in the *Fratricide Punished*, Hamlet is several times asserted to be suffering from melancholy, and in the Quarto he himself complains of it and gives the ground of his discontent—"I lack preferment"—in a way that recalls Kyd.⁶ In the

¹ See Bang, *Englische Studien*, xxviii, 229 f.; Boas's *Kyd*, and Thorndike's review of it, *Modern Language Notes*, 1902.

² Q I.

³ This likeness, noted first by Sarrazin, appears in his bustling importance (sympathetically treated, however, as Polonius' in Shakspeare is not), in his discovery of conspiracies and of the causes of things generally, in his regard for those higher in station, in his counsels to his son at parting, in his interest in rhetorical matters, and in small points like his outcry of "news, news" (cf. *Jeronimo*, I, 3, 90 f.).

⁴ The Osric of the Kydian *Hamlet* doubtless fell in the ultimate general slaughter like the corresponding Phantasma in *F. P.* The latter's death startles us in the same rude way as does that of the other foolish comic characters of Kyd—as that of Polonius who coughs (*F. P.*), yells ludicrously, and is stabbed, or of Pedringano who, on the gibbet, is "turned off" laughing; and this argues an original likeness between the characters themselves.—Piston is the droll in *Soliman and Perseda*.

⁵ I. e., as being the position most unfavorable to my contention that Shakspeare was influenced by Marston. Personally, I believe that the *F. P.* contains interpolations from the Shakspearean versions.

⁶ Q I, p. 29. Cf. *Jeronimo*, I, 1, 114-115. Whether also the description—

"Yes faith, this great world you see contents me not
No nor the spangled heuens, nor earth nor sea,
No nor Man," etc.—

be Kyd's, is doubtful; it seems rather to be a garbled report of Shakspeare's phrasing.

Fratricide, as in Shakspeare, Hamlet manipulates Phantasmo and frowns him down into a ridiculous acquiescence and self-contradiction; he admonishes Ophelia with cynical indecency; and he accosts Corambus¹ in a boisterous, mock-friendly way, calls him old Jephtha to his face and old fool behind his back, teases him about his daughter, mocks him and anticipates his news, in short, as the "old fool" himself avers, is always "vexing" him. And the butts, Corambis and Phantasmo, though foolish and droll rather than affected, manifest their foolish drollery in much the same way as Polonius and Osric do their affectation. To a Shakspeare all this, crude and primitive as it is, would, in that day of satire,² have been suggestion enough for much of the humorous satirist in Hamlet and of the affected fool in Polonius and Osric, without a hint from Marston.

Indeed, Marston's Malcontent, as now becomes plain, was himself an outgrowth of the Kydian Hamlet. Nobody was ever more influenced by another than was Marston by Kyd, especially in his *Hamlet*, and here is only another instance. Feliche, whom we have recognized as the Protomalcontent, distinctly recalls Hamlet—we mean now always the Kydian Hamlet—in the situations of rallying a young woman on her cosmetic foibles and of jeering sportively at the fools and ninnies about him: he represents the frisky teaser or satirist in Hamlet, as Antonio does the revenger.³ And Malevole recalls Hamlet's sportive jeering at his victims still more, especially when with the old court-marshal⁴ Bilioso (an immediate descendant, by the way, of Corambis and Jeronimo), whom he calls "old huddle"⁵ for "old Jephtha" and teases about his young wife in default of a daughter; and as much as Feliche he recalls Hamlet with Ophelia in his obscene raillery of Bianca on her feminine failings and her ass of a husband. In Malevole, moreover, the revenger and mock-madman of the early Hamlet—characters separated in *Antonio and Mel-*

¹ *Sic* in *F. P.*

² Cf. Shakspeare's own work at this time—*A. Y. L. I., All's Well, Measure for Measure*. It was the day of *Every Man in His Humour* and *Every Man out of His Humour*, the day of Hall, Marston, Tourneur, and Donne.

³ Feliche, too, is a "gentle boy"—and this makes his origin the more unmistakable—a blameless youth cut off in his flower. In the spirit of the description of others of his class, he is called the "very hope of Italy" (*Ant. Rev.*, I, 1).

⁴ "Hofmarschall" (*F. P.*, III, 5, etc.).

⁵ *Malc.*, I, 1, 79.

lida—are now reunited, and quite probably the uncouthness, the sarcasm and irony that in Malevole have nothing to do with revenge, are echoes from the “subtile answers” and mock-mad gambols of the archaic Kydian hero. And his melancholy, as Feliche’s, may well have been suggested by simple assertions such as those concerning Hamlet in the first Quarto¹ or those concerning Hieronimo in the *Spanish Tragedy*.²

The Malcontent—Feliche, Malevole—strikes root in the mock-madness of the Kydian Hamlet, just as the Shakspearean Hamlet strikes root in him as a whole; did they, then, in their later ramifications, ever meet? We must think so. Hamlet and Malevole have in common (and in common with no other character on the stage of their day) at least two points which, in the light of the external evidence, seem to have been derived by one from the other. They are the points, not yet elucidated, which, in either play, have so little to do with the action or the other characters that they were just the things to borrow³—the broodings on vanity and decay⁴ and the set, impersonal satire.⁵

¹ See above, p. 17. And, of course, it may be that in the original, as in the Quarto, Hamlet himself makes some description of his humor.

² Most of the remaining points of Feliche and Malevole—points missing in Hamlet, observe—were taken from the Macilente of Jonson’s *Every Man out of His Humour* (1599): the envious, hypocritical critic on the stage, the lover of discord and the mischief-maker, the scholarly, stoical, religious censor of abuses, and—in spite of all shortcomings—the sympathetically treated hero. Like Feliche, he distinguishes his hatred from envy (ed. Gifford, Routledge, p. 35b), and cries “ha! ha!” at the follies about him and at the mischief he causes (36, 43b); like Malevole, he not unjustly sets Deliro to doubting his wife (IV, 4), and delivers the closing words of the play; and like both, he utters various rhetorical outcries, beginning with an “Oh,” against the evils rampant about him or to the powers above, and complacently compares his own “parts” with those of the scamps who outstrip him (42a). All three are at times half consumed in the fire of their own rancor. Crites, on the other hand, another critic, in *Cynthia’s Revels* (1600), has no likeness to either Macilente or Marston’s Malcontents.—Macilente himself is slightly indebted to Marston’s Chrysegonus (in *Histrionastix*, 1599).

³ Professor Thorndike raises the objection that Malevole, unlike Jaques and Hamlet, is a mischief-maker and an accomplice. But in either case Shakspeare borrows only what is easily borrowed—the figure of the Malcontent. In *A. Y. L. I.* he follows the plot of Lodge’s *Rosalind*, and there is no room for the afterthought, Jaques, except as a critical do-nothing. In *Hamlet* he took over a plot already completed. The moral quality of Malevole’s conduct, moreover, is not to be cast up against him, nor does it put him in a different category. His is a feigned part and one within the scope of his revenge—considerations that in the drama of the day (witness *Hamlet* itself) were all-potent.

⁴ Before Shakspeare, there is not the slightest trace of a churchyard scene in any of the Kydian plays or derivatives; that in Tournur’s *Atheist’s Tragedy* is, as I have shown in *John Webster*, later than that in *Hamlet* and, in some respects, done in imitation of it.

⁵ Macilente (*vide supra*) has impersonal satire, but this, the only point of contact with Hamlet, is only in the form of outcries, like Feliche’s and some of Malevole’s, not in that of picturesque broodings like others of Malevole’s and like Hamlet’s.

The two points may be considered together. Like Malevole's, Hamlet's Malcontent broodings, as in the churchyard, are set, professional speeches, athwart the issues in hand and addressed to no one in particular,¹ on the theme—all is at last ruin and confusion, vanity and rottenness:

Think this:—this earth is the only grave and Golgotha wherein all things that live must rot; 'tis but the draught wherein the heavenly bodies discharge their corruption; the very muck-hill on which the sub-lunary orbs cast their excrements; man is the slime of this dung-pit, and princes are the governors of these men; for, for our souls, they are as free as emperors, all of one piece; there goes but a pair of shears betwixt an emperor and the son of a bag-piper; only the dying, dressing, pressing, glossing, makes the difference. (*Malc.*, IV, 2, 140-51.)

I ha' seen a sumptuous steeple turned to a stinking privy; more beastly, the sacrest place made a dog's kennel; nay, most inhuman, the stoned coffins of long-dead Christians burst up and made hogs' troughs: *hic finis Priami*. (II, 3, 195-200.)

Men. Wherefore dost thou think churches were made?

Mal. To scour plough-shares: I ha' seen oxen plough up altars; *et nunc seges ubi Sion fuit*. (*Malc.*, II, 3, 191.)

To quote from the churchyard scene would be an impertinence; there and in Hamlet's uncanny observations after the death of Polonius—

Your worm is your only emperor for diet: we fat all creatures else to fat us, and we fat ourselves for maggots: your fat king and your lean beggar is but variable service, two dishes, but to one table: that's the end.

King. Alas, alas!

Ham. A man may fish with that worm that hath eat of a king, and eat of the fish that hath fed of that worm.

King. What dost thou mean by this?

Ham. Nothing but to show you how a king may go a progress through the guts of a beggar. (IV, 3.)—

the reader will readily note the same relentless confounding of the high and the low, of the mean and the mighty, in the laystall of death. Blent with this, or occurring separately, there is the same vein of general satire—on the cunning lawyer at last put to confusion; on the flattering courtier stricken dumb; on the gay, painted lady unmasked and laid bare in her ugliness; on lisping,

¹ Horatio is here hardly more than an audience.

ambling mistresses; or on cuckolds.¹ And, like Malevole's once more, both satire and speculations are set, impersonal, persistent as a sermon. Yet, Hamlet's meditations show some differences. They are more dramatically formed and evoked, they insist rather on the gruesome transformations of death into regeneration than on the mere ruin of it, and they dwell upon particularities—the eye, the lip of the skull—with a piercing force.² For all their more dramatic cast, however, they betray—whether derived from Malevole's or not—a “humorous,” professional, Malcontent character,³ and even that persistent tracing of the movements of nature to an obscene and hideous conclusion, so prominent in them, is not unknown to Malevole.⁴

Before proceeding to a conclusion let us pause a moment to consider the possibilities arising from a connection, thus made probable, between Malevole and Shakspeare's Hamlet. We have been holding to the conviction that the *Malcontent* is the earlier play, and that in the case of a connection, therefore, it is Malevole that must be the source; but what if our chronology be yet insufficiently determined? Even then it is clear, I think, that Malevole could not have been influenced by Shakspeare's Hamlet—still less than by his Jaques—and that, if influence there was, it

¹ All this in the graveyard meditations and in the talk with Ophelia. Cf. in Bullen's ed., *Malc.*, pp. 212, 213, 216, 221, 241, 253, 261, 262. Cf. especially Feliche, *A. & M.*, 39, 40, 54-6. In both *A. & M.* and *Malc.* there is constant satire of the court and flatterers, directly by Feliche and Malevole, and indirectly by the ridiculous examples, Balurdo and Bilioso.

² The broodings of Hamlet in the graveyard, as I now think, influenced Vendice's over the skull in Tournour's *Rev. Tr.* (1607), I, 1, and Hippolito's in Dekker's *Hon. Whore* (1604), IV, 1. So, the influence of Shakspeare's *Hamlet* makes itself felt in the subsequent development of the revenge type earlier than I had supposed (*John Webster*, p. 113)—before the *Atheist's Tr.* in 1611. But the broodings of Bosola, being more humorous and less dramatically formed, without insistence on particularities or on the transformations of decay into regeneration, are, as I have there shown (pp. 133, 134), derived from Malevole's.

³ As when Hamlet addresses Ophelia only as the representative of her sex—“I have heard of your paintings too well enough,” etc.—and bids Horatio get him to “my Lady's chamber,” i. e., any lady's, “and tell her to this favor she must come;” but more especially in the general irrelevance of these meditations to the action of the play.

⁴ Exactly the same method as Hamlet uses, IV, 3, 20 f., and V, 1, 223 f., to show how a king may go a progress through the guts of a beggar or Alexander stop a beer-barrel, is used by Malevole to show how adultery is mother of incest, I, 1, 170 f. I by no means wish to appear to hold that the broodings of Malevole and Hamlet are in themselves so like as necessarily to have been derived one from the other; or that they are without parallel in the literature of the day. (In Donne's *Progress of the Soul* [see especially the preface] of this very year [1601] there is something of a parallel; and in some play now lost there may have been another.) But I do hold that the broodings are like enough to have been derived one from the other when found on the lips of characters already so similar in form and function.

must have run the other way. For Malevole is only the issue of a natural development from Feliche, and there is but one important point that they have not, and Malevole and Hamlet have, in common—the broodings on vanity and corruption. Now those of Malevole could not have been derived from those of Hamlet. Malevole's are "humorous," are presented in a set, impersonal, undramatic fashion; Hamlet's, though they bear traces of a humorous origin, are presented dramatically—by means of dialogue instead of single, isolated speeches, and by the highly appropriate stage-setting of the churchyard and the business of the skull. Hamlet's broodings as independent, without relation to a more simple, primitive source such as those of Malevole, are hard to conceive of; Malevole's as derived from them—in old-fashioned, humorous mould as they are, without a vestige of the striking business or stage-setting, both of which could have no more escaped a playwright like Marston than, later, they could escape Dekker and Tourneur¹—are not to be conceived of at all. History must be, if anything, conceivable, reasonable; and if an immediate influence is to be established between the Malcontents—the Protomalcontent Feliche is out of the question—it must be the only reasonable one, that of Malevole on Hamlet.

Our results are a little complex. Hamlet, in both form and function, is at many points extraordinarily like the Malcontent, Malevole—far more like him than like the Protomalcontent, Feliche, of the year before. Many of these points, however, seem, in the light of the *Fratricide Punished* and the first Quarto, to have been present, potentially at least, in the Kydian Hamlet, and need not be sought farther afield. The Malcontent, Marston's creation, in turn, was, through Feliche, himself evolved out of the mock-madness of the Kydian Hamlet; and thus it appears that Malevole, though far less immediately, sprang from the same source as the Hamlet of Shakspeare. Sprung from a source so remote and archaic, however, Hamlet and Malevole would hardly have turned out so similar—even at the points borrowed from Kyd—independently; and they actually have in

¹The skull in the *Honest Whore* and both of Tourneur's plays; the churchyard in the *Atheist's Tragedy* only.—For any or all of these there would have been room in the *Malcontent*—or Marston would have made room.

common two points unknown to Kyd or anyone else before them—points which are the core and essence of the *Malcontent*—impersonal, sermonizing meditation and satire. That these, directly or indirectly, were drawn from Marston (Marston could not have drawn them from Hamlet) is made more probable by various historical circumstances, such as the allusions to the Children, Marston's contemporary prominence as the Children's revenge poet, and the anterior date and the known vogue and influence as a revenge play of the *Malcontent* itself,—more probable, I say, but hardly certain. That, however, Shakspeare's Hamlet, by virtue of a partly common origin and of later, very similar, and surely not altogether unrelated, accretions and developments, conforms to the type of that rude stage-humor of which, after Kyd and Jonson, but far more than they, Marston had the making,—that medley of melancholy and cynicism, censoriousness and impudence, vivacity and uncouthness, somberness and obscene levity, impersonal satire and broodings on decay, called the *Malcontent*—is plain and certain enough.

ELMER EDGAR STOLL.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

SHAKESPEARE ET VOLTAIRE

"OTHELLO" ET "ZAÏRE"

Sous le premier titre de cet article, Mr. Lounsbury publiait naguère un assez gros volume.¹ C'est comme un chapitre développé d'un sujet plus général: Shakespeare en France, ou très général: Shakespeare en Europe. Attitude de Voltaire en face de Shakespeare, influence du poète anglais sur ses conceptions dramatiques, animosité de Voltaire contre Shakespeare, échos de cette lutte en Angleterre, telles sont les questions traitées dans ce livre. Rien de nouveau d'ailleurs.² C'est seulement une étude suivie, complète, et, à ce titre, fort utile, des rapports entre les deux poètes. Si je voulais ici discuter cet ouvrage, trois points principaux retiendraient mon attention: Mr. Lounsbury affirme la palinodie réelle de Voltaire à l'égard de Shakespeare, croit à l'influence profonde de ce dernier sur le théâtre du dix-huitième siècle, conteste le caractère national de notre tragédie classique. Sur ces questions importantes, sur la dernière en particulier, je ne partage pas l'opinion de l'auteur, et peut-être en dirai-je prochainement les raisons. Aujourd'hui, je m'en tiens à la pièce de *Zaïre*. Mr. Lounsbury pense qu'elle imite *Othello* de très près. C'est Villemain le premier qui porta jadis ce jugement.³ Dans un parallèle fameux, il comparait les deux tragédies, au grand désavantage de Voltaire. Après lui, la plupart des critiques ont rapproché *Zaïre* d'*Othello*, et reproduit peu ou prou les conclusions de leur illustre devancier. Mr. Lounsbury est absolument catégorique:

L'imitation d'*Othello* est flagrante. Elle s'étend à l'ensemble et aux détails. Dans les deux pièces, l'action roule sur une union mal assortie; dans les deux pièces, l'amour absorbe l'âme des principaux personnages;

¹ *Shakespeare and Voltaire*, by Thomas R. Lounsbury, L.H.D., LL.D., Professor of English in Yale University (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902).

² M. J. J. Jusserand, déjà célèbre par une histoire de la littérature anglaise, avait publié en 1899 un livre très informé, judicieux et spirituel sur *Shakespeare en France sous l'ancien régime*.

³ *Tableau de la littérature au 18^e siècle*, IX^e Leçon.

la jalousie du héros est la même, et aussi peu fondée; elle éclate par le même procédé, une lettre dans *Zaïre*, un mouchoir dans *Othello*. Dans les deux pièces, le confident est un traître; le dénouement est obtenu par le meurtre de l'héroïne. Enfin, dans les deux pièces, le héros, conscient de son crime et de son erreur, se tue en expiation.¹

En vérité, s'il en est ainsi, on s'indigne à bon droit que Voltaire, dans son *Épître dédicatoire*, ait oublié si complètement *Othello* et omis jusqu'au nom même de Shakespeare. Mais en est-il ainsi? Je me propose de l'examiner.

Écartons d'abord le reproche général qu'on fait à Voltaire d'avoir gardé le silence sur ses emprunts. Je ne ferai pas observer qu'il suppose résolue la question même de ces emprunts. Car enfin si Voltaire n'a pas imité Shakespeare, son silence ne mérite aucun blâme. Mais je vais plus loin, et, dussé-je paraître naïf ou paradoxal, voici comment je raisonne: Si Voltaire ne parle pas d'*Othello* dans sa préface, c'est qu'il pense ne lui rien devoir. Je sais bien que Voltaire ne fut jamais un modèle de délicatesse en matière littéraire; il a pris trop souvent son bien où il le trouvait, un peu en voleur, sans le dire. On cite en particulier le *Brutus*. Voltaire écrit dans son "Discours sur la tragédie" en tête de la pièce: "Nous nous étonnions qu'aucun Anglais n'eût traité ce sujet qui de tous est peut-être le plus convenable à votre théâtre." Or, c'était une erreur. Une tragédie de Nathaniel Lee, sur le même sujet, avait été représentée en 1681. Et un critique, Adam Hill, qui signale le fait à la date de 1735, accuse sans hésitation Voltaire de plagiat. Celui-ci se contenta de répondre par une note, en 1748: "Il y a un *Brutus* d'un auteur nommé Lee; c'est un ouvrage ignoré qu'on ne représente plus à Londres." Il se trompait encore. La pièce de Lee avait été imprimée l'année même de sa représentation, et ses œuvres dramatiques avaient eu plusieurs éditions. Seulement Voltaire l'ignorait. Comme le constate Mr. Lounsbury, il n'a qu'une légère connaissance des auteurs anglais qu'il mentionne; quant à ceux qu'il ne mentionne pas, il est cent fois certain qu'il les ignore totalement. Ce fut le cas de Lee.²

Mais, avec Shakespeare, il en va autrement. D'abord, si son admiration du génial poète est modérée, pleine même de réserves,

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 78.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 76, 77.

il ne la cache pas cependant. Il reconnaît volontiers que le théâtre anglais, personnifié dans Shakespeare, éveille en lui des idées nouvelles. Il loue *Julius Cæsar*, et signale en particulier la scène où Brutus et Antoine parlent au peuple romain, comme une des plus belles qui soient au théâtre; il avoue, ou peu s'en faut, qu'elle lui a inspiré sa *Mort de César*. A la vérité, dans la préface à l'édition de 1736, écrite par l'éditeur, mais inspirée par lui, nous lisons :

Shakespeare, père de la tragédie anglaise, est aussi le père de la barbarie qui y règne. Son génie sublime, sans culture et sans goût, a fait un chaos du théâtre qu'il a créé. Ses pièces sont des monstres dans lesquels il y a des parties qui sont des chefs-d'œuvre de la nature. Sa tragédie intitulée *La Mort de César* [erreur!] commence par son triomphe au Capitole et finit par la mort de Brutus et de Cassius à la bataille de Philippes. On assassine César sur le théâtre. On voit des sénateurs bouffonner avec la lie du peuple. C'est un mélange de ce que la tragédie a de plus terrible et de ce que la farce a de plus bas. Je ne fais que répéter ici ce que j'ai souvent entendu dire à celui dont je donne l'ouvrage au public. Il se détermina, pour satisfaire ses amis, à faire un *Jules César* qui, sans ressembler à celui de Shakespeare, fût pourtant tout entier dans le goût anglais.

Ne discutons pas ce jugement; s'il témoigne une médiocre intelligence de Shakespeare, à tout le moins il prouve que Voltaire ne reniait pas sa dette, qu'il voyait dans le *Julius Cæsar* la source inspiratrice de sa propre tragédie. L'aveu en est encore plus explicite dans une lettre à l'abbé Desfontaines (14 novembre 1735). Il l'invite à examiner le théâtre anglais, à lui comparer le théâtre français, si vide d'action, si dépouillé de grands intérêts; puis il ajoute :

Si vous aviez vu jouer la scène entière de Shakespeare (entre Brutus et Antoine), telle que je l'ai vue et telle que je l'ai à peu près traduite, nos déclarations d'amour et nos confidentes vous paraîtraient de pauvres choses auprès.

Autre exemple tiré de *Sémiramis*. C'est *Eriphyle* remaniée. Dans les deux pièces apparaît une ombre. Après la représentation d'*Eriphyle*, Voltaire, dans la préface, se réclamait d'Eschyle; pas un mot de Shakespeare. Est-ce donc de la mauvaise foi? J'ose dire que non. A cette date, introduire une ombre sur la scène était une hardiesse inouïe. Shakespeare, trop peu connu

encore, et certainement trop peu apprécié, eût tout gâté. Les anciens au contraire, autorité encore suprême, et, sinon toujours suivie, du moins respectée, étaient de meilleurs garants. Voilà pourquoi Voltaire omet Shakespeare et cite Eschyle. Au reste, l'on sait que la pièce d'*Eriphyle* ne fut jamais imprimée. Si elle l'eût été, Voltaire n'aurait pas caché son emprunt. Lisez en effet *Sémiramis* qui n'est autre qu'*Eriphyle* sous un nom différent. Le point délicat à justifier c'est toujours l'apparition de l'ombre. Quelle autorité invoque-t-il en premier lieu? Shakespeare. Pourquoi aujourd'hui et non hier? Par crainte des lecteurs mieux informés, affirme Mr. Lounsbury.¹ Bien que Voltaire, en d'autres circonstances, mérite une opinion aussi injurieuse, elle me paraît ici gratuite. Simplement, il se couvre de Shakespeare, parce que, en 1748, l'opinion française n'étant plus rebelle au grand tragique, son nom aura plus de poids, et justice pourra lui être rendue. D'ailleurs, Voltaire s'appuie encore sur Eschyle, non pour diminuer sa dette à l'égard de *Hamlet*, mais parce que, après tout, les *Perses* lui sont antérieurs, parce que Shakespeare n'avait pas inventé ce ressort d'émotion dramatique, parce qu'il était bon, il était nécessaire de joindre l'autorité des anciens à celle de Shakespeare. Je m'arrête à ces exemples; il m'est permis maintenant d'offrir une double conclusion: d'abord, que Voltaire n'a jamais nié ses emprunts réels. S'il ne reconnaît pas sa dette aussi pleinement que le voudraient certains critiques, je dirai, non qu'il a tort, mais qu'elle ne lui est pas apparue aussi large qu'à eux-mêmes. A-t-il bien ou mal jugé? Il serait trop long de l'examiner dans chacune de ces pièces. Je l'essaierai tout à l'heure à propos de *Zaïre*. Et voici ma seconde conclusion: dès lors que Voltaire, dans sa préface, garde un silence complet sur Shakespeare, il faut penser avec lui qu'il n'a pas voulu l'imiter, qu'il ne se sent à aucun degré précis son débiteur. Songez en outre que Voltaire dédie sa pièce à un Anglais, Falkener, commerçant heureux et lettré. Si vous admettez que l'imitation d'*Othello* est flagrante, comment Falkener ne s'en est-il pas aperçu? Comment l'oubli impertinent de Voltaire n'a-t-il pas blessé l'orgueil national? Or, Falkener ne protesta point. Ne

¹ *Shakespeare and Voltaire*, p. 126.

serait-ce donc pas qu'il partageait avec beaucoup de ses contemporains l'opinion de son illustre correspondant?

Ce qui a trompé sans doute Mr. Lounsbury, et, avant lui, Villemain et puis d'autres critiques encore, c'est qu'ils voient trop en *Zaïre* une peinture de la jalousie. Orosmane est jaloux; Othello est jaloux; donc Orosmane reproduit Othello. Si je force le raisonnement, je traduis bien leur pensée. Je crois qu'ils commettent une erreur. Mais admettons-la un instant. De ce qu'Orosmane est jaloux, s'ensuit-il qu'il reproduise Othello? Pourquoi pas aussi bien Hermione, Roxane, Mithridate de Racine? Ne pouvait-on, même à cette époque, représenter la jalousie sans imiter Shakespeare? Et si l'on veut à toute force que Voltaire ait imité quelqu'un, pourquoi pas, je le répète, Racine? Encore une fois Hermione, Roxane, Mithridate étaient d'excellents modèles; même le traître ne manque pas; dans sa scélératesse concentrée Narcisse (*Britannicus*) vaut Iago. Dirait-on qu'en ce temps-là Voltaire se nourrissait de Shakespeare? J'affirme que Racine lui était plus familier encore et qu'il était son maître d'élection. En vérité, je prouverais facilement que, dans *Zaïre* et ailleurs, Voltaire est plutôt le disciple de Racine que celui de Shakespeare.¹

Au reste, *Zaïre* n'est pas une étude de la jalousie. Examinons en effet la pièce. Au premier acte, *Zaïre* cause avec Fatime dans le palais d'Orosmane où elle a été élevée. Elle avoue avec une sorte de fierté heureuse qu'elle aime le Soudan, qu'elle en est aimée. A la suivante qui lui parle de la religion chrétienne, elle répond avec ravissement: "Orosmane m'aime, et j'ai tout oublié." De son côté, le Soudan la comble de galanteries délicates, à peine interrompues par l'arrivée soudaine de Nérestan, revenu de France avec la rançon de dix chevaliers captifs. Un combat de générosité s'engage entre les deux héros. Orosmane accorde la liberté de cent chevaliers; il n'excepte que Lusignan. "Pour *Zaïre*, dit-il, elle n'est pas d'un prix qui soit en ta puissance."

¹ Mais, dirait-on, s'il est vrai qu'il doive tant à Racine, pourquoi Voltaire ne le déclarait-il pas expressément? N'est-ce pas de la mauvaise foi à l'égard de Racine? Je réponds que dédiant sa pièce à un Anglais, il n'avait pas à lui rappeler ses modèles français. D'ailleurs, dans cette épître, tout en constatant ses lacunes, il exalte la tragédie française qu'il personnifie en Racine. Il s'est toujours proclamé son disciple; il s'est toujours inspiré de lui. On le savait, on le disait. Loin de protester, Voltaire s'en fit une gloire.

Et il renvoie Nérestan d'un geste de maître. C'est alors que pour la première fois Orosmane dit à Corasmin: "Que veut cet esclave infidèle? Il soupirait, . . . ses yeux se sont tournés vers elle. . . ." Est-ce de la jalousie? Orosmane en repousse la pensée même; il sait que Zaïre l'aime, et qu'il l'aime "avec idolâtrie." Pas le moindre doute en son âme. Cela est si vrai que dans les deux actes suivants il n'est pas une fois question de jalousie. Avouez que si Voltaire avait songé principalement à peindre cette passion, il eût été bien maladroit. Or, il est peut-être tout, excepté cela, et Villemain écrase trop aisément Orosmane sous Othello. L'acte deuxième est presque entièrement consacré aux scènes fameuses de reconnaissance. De ces coups de théâtre naît le drame. Quel drame? Le conflit entre l'amour et la religion. Au début du troisième acte, Orosmane s'entretient avec son confident; celui-ci s'étonne que le sultan ait facilité une nouvelle entrevue de Nérestan avec Zaïre. "Pourquoi pas?" répond Orosmane; ils ont été captifs ensemble dès leur jeune âge. Et puis, Zaïre l'a voulu." Aucun soupçon. Un peu plus tard, il presse Zaïre d'être son épouse. Sous divers prétextes, elle demande des délais. Le Soudan s'étonne, s'irrite, mais cède. Zaïre partie, Orosmane se demande: "Si c'était ce Français!" Cette pensée le met en fureur. Mais il la repousse comme honteuse:

Non, c'est trop sur Zaïre arrêter un soupçon,
Non, son cœur n'est point fait pour une trahison.

Ainsi, pas de vraie jalousie; de la colère seulement contre un caprice qu'il ne peut comprendre. Bientôt, il brise en son cœur avec Zaïre, il ordonne de fermer les portes du sérail. Mais c'est de l'orgueil blessé. Voyez plutôt l'entrevue du quatrième acte. Orosmane déclare à Zaïre qu'il la rejette loin de lui. Que lui reproche-t-il? Son infidélité? Pas le moins du monde; son caprice seulement. Et comme Zaïre pleure, il s'attendrit, si bien que Zaïre implorant encore un jour de délai, il le lui accorde, non sans inquiétude, mais sans défiance. "On m'aime, c'est assez."¹ Il faut une lettre ambiguë de Nérestan pour provoquer une soudaine explosion de jalousie. Enfin, nous y voilà! cette

¹ IV, 3.

lettre rappelle bien le mouchoir de Desdémone. Mais pas du tout; cela rappelle *Bajazet* de Racine, le billet à Atalide, les fureurs de Roxane, le piège qu'elle tend.¹ Tout est analogue. C'est pourquoi le cinquième acte ne reproduit pas, quoi qu'on dise, celui d'*Othello*, malgré les apparences. Dans les deux pièces sans doute, le meurtre de l'héroïne est un effet de la jalousie. Mais dans *Zaïre*, la jalousie, bien que naturelle, est un pur accident, un moyen nécessaire de dénouement; dans *Othello*, elle est toute la tragédie et aboutit logiquement à la mort de Desdémone. Quelques involontaires et fatales ressemblances de détail ne peuvent accuser l'imitation. Reste le suicide d'Orosmane. Vous songez à celui d'*Othello*. Et je conviens que la similitude est frappante. Alors, imitation? Peut-être. Mais rappelez-vous Hermione se tuant après le meurtre de Pyrrhus;² dites-vous que la logique de la situation, de la passion surtout, conduisait d'elle-même à ce meurtre; et décidez si, au lieu d'imitation, il ne faut pas parler plutôt de coïncidence inévitable. C'était évidemment l'opinion de Voltaire. Car il se tait sur *Othello* en 1736, date de la deuxième édition de *Zaïre*, comme en 1732. Or, ses *Lettres philosophiques*, où il révélait Shakespeare à la France, avaient paru en 1734. De la part des contemporains mieux informés, il pouvait redouter un rapprochement accusateur. Cependant, il se tait. Quant à moi, bien que la ressemblance semble trop exacte pour être fortuite, je penche à croire qu'il a eu raison.

Jusqu'ici donc les deux pièces sont différentes. Cette différence éclatera plus visible si nous poussons l'analyse à fond. Nous n'avons pas trouvé la jalousie comme passion principale. En revanche, il y a dans *Zaïre* un conflit dramatique entre la religion et l'amour. Je ne fais pas une découverte; mais quoique d'autres m'aient précédé, j'en dois parler après eux. Et d'abord, c'est une tragédie d'amour. Que Voltaire l'ait ainsi voulue, ses lettres, outre la pièce même, l'attestent. Il écrit à son ami Formont:

Tout le monde me reproche ici que je ne mets pas d'amour dans mes pièces. Ils en auront cette fois-ci, et je vous jure que ce ne sera pas de la galanterie. Je veux qu'il n'y ait rien de si turc, de si chrétien, de si

¹ *Bajazet*, IV, 5.

² *Andromaque*, V.

amoureux, de si tendre, de si furieux, que ce que je versifie à présent pour leur plaisir. J'ai déjà l'honneur d'en avoir fait un acte. Ou je suis fort trompé, ou ce sera la pièce la plus singulière que nous ayons au théâtre. Les noms de Montmorency, de saint Louis, de Saladin, de Jésus, de Mahomet s'y trouveront. On y parlera de la Seine et du Jourdain, de Paris et de Jérusalem. On aimera, on baptisera, on tuera. . . .¹

Et en effet regardons Zaïre. Élevée dès son enfance dans le sérail, elle y grandit sous l'œil du sultan. A son insu, l'amour naît dans son cœur, l'envahit avec une force douce et irrésistible. Avant d'être chrétienne, elle s'abandonne à lui avec ravissement:

Je ne connais que lui, sa gloire, sa puissance;
Vivre sous Orosmane est ma seule espérance;
Le reste est un vain songe. . . .
Je ne vois qu'Orosmane, et mon âme enivrée
Se remplit du bonheur de s'en voir adorée.
Mets-toi devant les yeux sa grâce, ses exploits;
Songe à ce bras puissant, vainqueur de tant de rois,
A cet aimable front que la gloire environne.²

Cet amour se connaît; cette passion garde sa fierté. Zaïre ne veut pas d'une couronne éphémère, du rang honteux de maîtresse. Plutôt la mort. Sa modestie virginale ne comprend que la dignité d'épouse. Devant Orosmane, quand ils chantent leurs duos d'amour, toute frémissante, elle s'exprime pourtant avec une ardeur contenue.³ Ou bien, elle se redresse avec orgueil, quand il l'insulte d'un soupçon.⁴ Chrétienne, son amour reste invincible, mais devient douloureux et se mouille de larmes. Jamais d'éclat, jamais de violence. C'est la décence, la pudeur dans la passion profonde et tragique. Je songe à une sœur modeste des Andromaque, des Bérénice, des Monime. Certes, je comprends qu'elle

¹ 29 mai, 1732; XXXIII, 272.

² I, 1; cf. I, 2. Ces vers rappellent un peu le poétique couplet de Bérénice:

Titus m'aime; il peut tout: il n'a plus qu'à parler . . .
De cette nuit, Phénice, as-tu vu la splendeur?
Tes yeux ne sont-ils pas tout pleins de sa grandeur?
Ces flambeaux, ce bûcher, cette nuit enflammée,
Ces aigles, ces faisceaux, ce peuple, cette armée . . .
Cette pourpre, cet or que rehaussait sa gloire . . .
Parle: peut-on le voir sans penser, comme moi,
Qu'en quelque obscurité que le sort l'eût fait naître,
Le monde, en le voyant, eût reconnu son maître? (I, 5.)

Cf. *Andromaque*, II, 3.

³ I, 2.

⁴ IV, 6.

ait séduit les contemporains puisqu'elle nous charme encore. Or, c'est la tragédie d'amour, et non un drame de jalousie, qui les enchantait. Outre la vérité générale, Zaïre reproduisait quelques traits de modèles vivants, Adrienne Lecouvreur, M^{lle} Aïssé. Universelle et moderne, tragique par surcroît, elle est bien différente de Desdémone, instinctive, candide, passive, enfant plutôt que jeune fille. C'est pourquoi, sans nier son rôle touchant, j'ose lui préférer Zaïre.

J'aime moins Orosmane. Voltaire a beau écrire à l'ami Formont: "Mon amoureux n'est pas un jeune abbé à la toilette d'une bégueule. C'est le plus passionné, le plus fier, le plus tendre, le plus généreux, le plus justement jaloux, le plus cruel et le plus malheureux de tous les hommes."¹ S'il est tout cela, c'est en dépit des mœurs turques. Ce Soudan méprise les mœurs du sérail, se confond en tendresses délicates:

Je sais vous estimer autant que je vous aime,
Et sur votre vertu me fier à vous-même. . . .
Je me croirais hâ d'être aimé faiblement.²

Devant les caprices ou plutôt les irrésolutions de Zaïre, il s'incline, malgré son impatience, avec une grâce chevaleresque. Et quand sa colère éclate, il a, pour rompre, une galanterie hautaine qui le sauve à la fois du ridicule et de la brutalité.³ Vraiment, il est aussi peu Turc que possible; il aime sans doute avec passion, mais comme Pyrrhus, et à la française. Othello amoureux écrase Orosmane. Sans vouloir refaire une analyse cent fois faite, je rappelle avec quelle simplicité, avec quelle franchise mâle, au début de la pièce, ce général de fortune raconte son amour. Tant qu'il est heureux, cet amour s'étale avec une joie naïve et profonde. Puis, c'est le More, crédule comme un enfant, violent comme un sauvage, le noir qui a du sang africain dans les veines, et dont les passions violentes, contenues jusqu'ici, s'allument à l'étincelle de la jalousie. Rien de plus poignant que les souffrances de cet amour blessé, que les ravages de cette jalousie, jusqu'au dénouement tragique où l'entraîne son aveuglement. On a épuisé les formules admiratives sur ce caractère si merveilleusement étudié. Il est bien vrai que l'Othello de Shakespeare est

¹ 25 juin, 1732; XXXIII, 273.

² I, 2.

³ IV, 3.

incomparable. Ce ne fut pas l'opinion de Voltaire, je le sais. En peignant Orosmane, il crut surpasser son sublime rival. Il voulut faire et fit certainement autre chose. Ce qui revient à dire qu'il ne l'imita point.

Autre différence: les mœurs chrétiennes. Admettons, comme il le dit, que Voltaire doive au théâtre anglais la hardiesse d'avoir mis sur la scène les noms de nos rois et des anciennes familles du royaume.¹ On accordera que cette inspiration un peu vague n'ôte rien à l'originalité du poète. L'idée neuve de la pièce est bien l'idée chrétienne. Elle se dresse, dès la début, en face de l'amour profane; à mesure qu'elle grandit, elle s'y oppose davantage; elle pénètre, elle pare tout de ses couleurs. Quelque chose du souffle des croisades palpite dans l'âme de Nérestan, de Châtillon, surtout dans l'âme de Lusignan. Dieu, Jésus-Christ, la délivrance du saint tombeau, haine du musulman, fidélité à la foi jusqu'au martyre, c'est le thème des pensées et des discours, cela imprègne le drame d'esprit religieux, lui prête un intérêt nouveau et profond. Voltaire répond victorieusement à Boileau qui, malgré le *Polyeucte* de Corneille, avait proscrit le merveilleux chrétien. Et c'est de quoi Châteaubriand félicite l'auteur de *Zaïre*, je veux dire d'avoir compris le pouvoir dramatique du christianisme qui suscite des conflits moraux entre les passions, et son pouvoir pathétique, à cause des souvenirs sacrés qu'il rappelle.² Oui, il y a de tout cela dans *Zaïre*.

Et pourtant, ici, je sens des réserves se lever dans mon esprit. S'il faut avouer toute ma pensée, ce christianisme ne me paraît pas absolument sincère, de bonne marque. J'ai pu m'en douter dès le commencement, lorsque *Zaïre* disserte en philosophe sur la diversité des religions:

Je le vois trop: les soins qu'on prend de notre enfance
Forment nos sentiments, nos mœurs, notre croyance.
J'eusse été près du Gange esclave des faux dieux,
Chrétienne dans Paris, musulmane en ces lieux.
L'instruction fait tout; et la main de nos pères
Grave en nos faibles cœurs ces premiers caractères.³

¹ *Épître dédicatoire* à Mr. Falkener, éd. Garnier, p. 147.

² *Génie du christianisme*, II^e Partie, Livre II, p. 207.

³ I, 1.

Singulière préface à l'exaltation de la foi chrétienne! Il y a bien, je le sais, la belle tirade de Lusignan: "Grand Dieu! j'ai combattu soixante ans pour ta gloire," etc. Voltaire est entré autant qu'il l'a pu, et, si je l'ose dire, dans la peau du vénérable personnage; pas dans son cœur. Ce discours du vieux chevalier sonne comme de l'excellente rhétorique. Quant à Nérestan, lorsqu'il tente d'expliquer à Zaïre le baptême, l'*efficace* de la grâce, je vois bien qu'il sait son catéchisme. Mais la foi, mais l'accent de conviction intime, cela n'y est pas. Ah! que Néarque, dans une occasion semblable, parle autrement à Polyeucte, et que celui-ci, prêchant le christianisme à Pauline, est autrement éloquent!¹ Corneille laisse aller son cœur, Voltaire joue avec son esprit. Son arrière-pensée se trahit dans les vers, cités plus haut, sur l'origine des religions, dans ceux où Zaïre regrette que Dieu, dont cent fois on lui peignit la bonté, réprouve une chère alliance, et dans ceux où elle n'est pas loin de trouver sa loi barbare.² En somme, quelle est la source de la pitié que nous inspire la jeune héroïne, qu'elle inspirera du moins à la généralité des spectateurs? La voici: Zaïre est innocente, Zaïre serait heureuse si le christianisme ne venait à la traverse de son bonheur. Elle est victime d'une religion intransigeante, Voltaire dirait, du fanatisme. Je suis presque certain qu'il eût souri malicieusement à l'opinion, d'ailleurs ironique, de Châteaubriand. Au reste, il n'importe. En dépit de ces réserves, le cadre de *Zaïre* demeure indubitablement chrétien. L'effort de Voltaire pour se dégager de lui-même, pour s'oublier, n'a jamais été plus sensible ni même plus réussi. Et cela, joint à la peinture toute française de l'amour, à la donnée originale de la pièce, établit sa complète indépendance à l'égard de Shakespeare. *Zaïre* est une pièce classique. Je ne songe pas seulement aux trois unités, à l'absence du comique, à la condition royale des personnages, à leur langage souvent pompeux. *Zaïre* est classique au meilleur sens du mot. Comme les meilleures tragédies de Corneille et de Racine, elle place le drame dans un conflit d'ordre général. De là, un intérêt universel et durable.

Je conclus. Il est certain que Voltaire a subi l'influence du

¹ *Polyeucte*, I, 1; II, 6; IV, 2, 3.

² III, 4, 5.

théâtre anglais et de Shakespeare en particulier. Cela est vrai aussi pour tout le dix-huitième siècle. Mais on a beaucoup exagéré cette influence. Ne parlons ici que de Voltaire. Deux ou trois pièces exceptées—*La Mort de César*, *Sémiramis*¹—elle ne porte guère sur le fond ni sur l'esprit ni sur la conduite de ses tragédies. Il a puisé chez les Anglais une action plus saisissante, le goût des péripéties, le souci du spectacle, un désir de liberté plus grande, en somme, quelque chose d'extérieur. Et si l'on arrête dans ces bornes l'imitation d'*Othello* à propos de *Zaire*, si on la réduit à quelques ressemblances de détail inévitables, nous sommes d'accord. J'ai eu le dessein de prouver l'originalité de *Zaire*, non pour diminuer la gloire de Shakespeare—elle est au-dessus de toute atteinte—non pour lui disputer sa part d'influence, lorsqu'elle est certaine, mais pour rendre justice à Voltaire, quand il y a droit. Il se trouve que son chef-d'œuvre² est, à mon avis, de source et de couleur entièrement françaises. J'ai du plaisir à le proclamer.

E. J. DUBEDOUT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

¹ Je ne cite pas *Mahomet*. Mr. Lounsbury le rapproche de *Macbeth*. D'après lui, *Palmyre* reproduit *Lady Macbeth*. Je ne vois entre les deux héroïnes aucun rapport de caractère, de situation, de passion ni de langage. Si une simple analogie suffisait pour crier à l'imitation, je songerais plutôt à *Rodogune* de Corneille, où une jeune princesse pousse son amant au meurtre de sa mère. Je songerais encore au *Marchand de Londres* de Lillo. Mais d'ailleurs, après analyse et comparaison, je serais tenté de conclure que Voltaire ne s'est peut-être souvenu d'aucune de ces deux pièces.

² Ce qui ne veut pas dire une pièce sans défauts.

GREENE'S "MENAPHON" AND "THE THRACIAN WONDER"

1. In William Warner's *Albion's England*¹ is told the pastoral story of Curan and Argentile. The following is a brief outline:² Adelbright, upon his deathbed, intrusted his only child, the princess Argentile, to the guardianship of his brother, Edel. Edel, scheming to make himself sole king of the realm, kept his niece mewed up from all suitors. The fame of her beauty, however, spread over all the world. Curan, "son unto a prince in Danske," disguised himself as a kitchen drudge, and thus secured access to the princess, revealed his noble birth, and declared his love. "Her answer was, she husbandless would stay." The uncle, discovering the secret courtship of the kitchen groom, began to urge the suit, for by such an ignoble match he hoped effectively to dispose of his niece. In order to escape the designs of her uncle, Argentile fled to the fields and took up the quiet life of a shepherdess. "When Curan heard of her escape, the anguish in his heart was more than much, and after her from court he did depart." He settled as a shepherd near the spot where Argentile daily tended her flocks. Soon, by chance, he met the beautiful shepherdess, and "then began a second loue, the worser of the twaene." Argentile yielded to the suit of the importunate shepherd, disclosed her identity, and all ended happily.

2. So far as I can learn, no one has suggested this story as the source of Robert Greene's *Menaphon*. *Albion's England* was printed in 1586, *Menaphon* appeared in 1589; Greene, therefore, was probably familiar with Warner's poem. In his novel he has used the same general plot; this, however, he has modified, expanded, and filled in with details. From England the scene is transferred to the more conventional Arcadia; the uncle is changed

¹ Book IV, chap. xx.

² The outline given by Collier (*Poet. Decam.*, Vol. I, pp. 265, 266), and often quoted, is materially incorrect. Curan is not driven from court, nor did the princess love him at all until the second courtship. Moreover, he followed her into the country, and not she him.

to the harsh father; a child is added; the rural background is fully developed; and the closing events are treated in detail. For the plots of his novels Greene needed little more than a suggestion; this, in the case of *Menaphon*, came, I believe, from *Albion's England*.

3. In 1617 the story appeared in a third version by William Webster:

The most pleasant and delightful Historie of Curan, a Prince of Danske, and the fayre Princesse Argentile, Daughter and Heyre to Adelbright, sometime King of Northumberland. Shewing His first Loue vnto her, his successlesse suits, and the low deiections he underwent for her sake. His second Loue to the same Lady unknowne, taking her for a poore Countrie Damsell. She (by reason of the vnkindnesse of King Edell her vnkle and Gardian) hauing forsooke the Court, and vndertooke the profession of a Neatherdes Mayde. His constant loue (after her long continued unkindnes) rewarded with her wished consent, their happie Nuptials, and mutuall reioycings, his valour and victorious warre with King Edell. And lastly his peacefull installment in the Kingly Throne. Enterlacte with many pritty and pithie prayeses of beauty, and other amorous discourses, pleasing, smooth and delightfull. By William Webster. London. 1617. [4to, 32 leaves; a poem in six-line stanzas.]¹

This is obviously founded on Warner's *Albion's England*. "It is much expanded," says Collier; "the incidents are related in more detail, and the speeches of the persons given at greater length."² The work is inaccessible to me; the title, however, indicates no borrowing whatever from Greene.³

4. In 1661 Francis Kirkman printed a play called *The Thracian Wonder*, assigning it on the title-page to John Webster and William Rowley. In his remarks addressed to the reader he gives the following introduction:

It is now the second time of my appearing in print in this nature: I should not have troubled you, but that I believe that you will be as well pleased as myself; I am sure that when I applied myself to buying and

¹ Hazlitt's *Hand-Book*, p. 647.

² There is another case of borrowing from Warner's poem, which perhaps deserves notice. "The 11th Ballad in Evans's Collection (Vol. I, edit. 1777) is an impudent plagiarism from Warner, in which generally his very words, with a slight alteration, are used: the names are changed for better concealment."—Collier.

³ The last reference that I can find to this poem is in the catalogue of Heber's sale (1836). His copy which cost him £15 15s sold for £4 10s. Apparently it is the only copy in existence. It is not in the British Museum or in the Bodleian Library.

reading of books, I was very well satisfied when I could purchase a new play. I have promised you three this term,—*A Cure for a Cuckold* was the first; this the second; and the third, viz. *Gamer Gurton's Needle*, is ready for you . . . I have several manuscripts of this nature, written by worthy authors; and I account it much pity they should now lie dormant, and buried in oblivion.

Writers on the drama are generally agreed that Kirkman was mistaken in attributing the play to Webster and Rowley.¹ Mr. Fleay alone has attempted to identify the real author. He is sure that the play is one of Heywood's lost pieces:

1598, Dec. 6; 1599, Jan. 26. *War without blows and Love without suit* ("without strife" in the second entry). This is the same play as *The Thracian Wonder*; cf. in i. 2, "You never shall again renew your suit;" but the love is given at the end without any suit; and in iii. 2, "Here was a happy war finished without blows." It was probably, like many other of Heywood's plays, revived for the Queen's men c. 1607, when W. Rowley and Webster were writing for them; whence the absurd attribution of the authorship to them by Kirkman.²

With remarkable inconsistency Mr. Fleay later in the same work³ says:

The probable date of production is c. 1617, and the compaſſy Prince Charles'. The plot is from *Curan and Argentele*, William Webster's poem, 1617, which was an enlargement of Warner's story in his *Albion's England*, 1586.

It is hard to see how a play performed in 1598, and revived in 1607, could take its plot from a work dating 1617.

In assigning the source of the play to the pastoral poems of Warner and of Webster, Mr. Fleay is following all other writers on the subject.⁴ Hence his trouble with dates. The dramatist, however, had in mind, not Warner or Webster, but Greene's

¹ "Kirkman probably knowing the story and that a man of the name of Webster (meaning William Webster) had versified it, thought he might attribute it safely to his name-sake John Webster." Collier, *Poet. Decam.*, Vol. I, pp. 268, 269. Kirkman's professional reputation was perhaps not of the best. On the title page of the first (separate) edition of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Beggar's Bush*, Printed for H. Robinson and Anne Mosely, 1661, appears the following notice conspicuously displayed: "You may speedily expect those other Playes, which Kirkman and his Hawkers have deceived the buyers withall, selling them at treble the value, that this and the rest will be sold for, which are the only originall and corrected copies, as they were first purchased by us at no mean rate, and since printed by us."

² *Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, Vol. I, p. 287.

³ *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 332.

⁴ See Collier, Dyce, Hazlitt, Sidney Lee, etc.

popular and well-known novel, *Menaphon*.¹ In his introduction to *Menaphon* Mr. Arber says: "It is really in its form a Prose Play enlivened by Songs." The author of *The Thracian Wonder* proves Mr. Arber's statement; he has followed the story as closely as did Shakespeare in dramatizing *Pandosto* or *Rosalind*.² The following is a comparison of the dramatis personæ of the two pieces:³

"THRACIAN WONDER"

Pheander, king of Thrace; later disguised; falls in love with his own daughter.

Ariadne, daughter to Pheander; disguised as shepherdess queen.

King of Sicilia.

Radagon, son to Sicilia; in love with Ariadne; disguised as the shepherd Menalcas.

Sophos, uncle to Ariadne; takes side of the lovers.

Eusanius, son to Ariadne and Radagon; lost; disguised as shepherd pays court to his mother.

King of Africa, who rears Eusanius in his court.

Lillia Guida, daughter to Africa, in love with Eusanius.

Antimon, shepherd; rescues Ariadne, pays suit to her, and, being rejected, thrusts her from his cote.

Palemon, shepherd swain in love with Serena.

"MENAPHON"

Democles, king of Arcadia; later disguised; falls in love with his own daughter.

Sephestia, daughter to Democles; disguised as shepherdess queen.

King of Thrace.

Maximus, son to Thrace; in love with Sephestia; disguised as shepherd Melicertus.

Lamedon, uncle to Sephestia; takes side of lovers.

Pleusidippus, son to Sephestia and Maximus; lost; disguised as shepherd pays court to his mother.

King of Thrace, who rears Pleusidippus in his court.

Olympia, daughter to Thrace; in love with Pleusidippus.

Menaphon, shepherd; rescues Sephestia, pays suit to her, and, being rejected, thrusts her from his cote.

Doron, shepherd swain, in love with Carmela.

¹ Mr. Fleay's ingenious identification of *The Thracian Wonder* with Heywood's play is thus, in reality, free from conflict in dates. *Menaphon* was printed in 1589; the entry in Henslowe is dated 1598: "Lent vnto Robarte shawe, the 6 of desembr 1598 to bye a Boocke called ware with owt blowes & love with owt sewte of Thomas hawodes some of iij 11." And again: "Lent vnto Robart shawe the 26 of Janewarye 1598 to paye Thomas hawode in full payment for his boocke called Ware with owt blowes & loue with owt stryfe the some of xxx s."

² A careful comparison of the play with Warner's poem shows no borrowing whatever.

³ I am responsible for both dramatis personæ.

"THRACIAN WONDER"	"MENAPHON"
<i>Serena</i> , shepherdess beloved by Palemon.	<i>Carmela</i> , shepherdess beloved by Doron.
<i>Clown</i> , a coarse, foolish shepherd.	(Probably suggested by the clownish lovemaking of Doron and Carmela.)
<i>Tityrus</i> , shepherd who disdains love, is overcome by Ariadne.	(Probably suggested by Menaphon's early disdain of love, and later conquest by Sephestia.)
<i>Pythia</i> , priestess at Delphi.	<i>Pythia</i> , priestess at Delphi.
<i>Two Lords</i> , ambassadors to Delphi.	<i>Two Lords</i> , ambassadors to Delphi.
<i>Lords, attendants, soldiers, shepherds, and shepherdesses.</i>	<i>Lords, attendants, soldiers, pirates, shepherds, and shepherdesses.</i>

It would be tedious to trace the similarity of plot throughout. The two works are within reach of everyone. I have collected, however, a number of passages borrowed with little change from *Menaphon*. I do not claim that these are all the passages thus borrowed; a more careful study would probably reveal others. The following, however, are conclusive enough:

I, 2; p. 129:¹

Tit. Yes, prithee mark it;
I'll tell thee my opinion now of love.

Love is a law, a discord of such force,
That 'twixt our sense and reason makes divorce;
Love's a desire, that to obtain betime,
We lose an age of years pluck'd from our prime;
Love is a thing to which we soon consent,
As soon refuse, but sooner far repent.

Menaphon, pp. 88, 89:²

But Gentlemen, since we haue talkte of Loue so long, you shall giue me leaue to shewe my opinion of that foolish fancie thus.

What thing is Loue? It is a power diuine
That raines in vs: or else a wreakefull law
That doomes our mindes, to beautie to encline. . . .

Loue is a discord, and a strange diuorce
Betwixt our sense and reason, by whose power,
As madde with reason, we admit that force. . . .

The numbers refer to Hazlitt's edition of *Webster's Dramatic Works* (1857), Vol. IV.
The numbers refer to Arber's reprint of *Menaphon*.

Loue's a desire, which for to waite a time,
 Dooth loose an age of yeeres, and so doth passe,
 As dooth the shadow seuerd from his prime,
 Seeming as though it were, yet neuer was.
 Leauing behinde nought but repentant thoughts
 Of daies ill spent, for that which profits noughts.

I, 2; p. 129:

They're like the winds upon Lapanthae's shore,
 That still are changing: O, then love no more!

Menaphon, p. 25:

As vpon the shoares of *Lapanthe* the winds continue neuer
 one day in one quarter, so the thoughtes of a louer neuer continue
 scarce a minute in one passion.

I, 2; p. 129:

A woman's love is like that Syrian flower,
 That buds, and spreads, and withers in an hour.

Menaphon, p. 43:

. . . like the hearbes in *Syria*, that flourish in the morne, and
 fade before night.

I, 2; p. 132:

See where she comes!
 Like to Diana in her summer's weed,
 Going to sport by Arethusa's fount.

Menaphon, p. 41:

Like to *Diana* in her Summer weede
 Girt with a crimson roabe of brightest die,
 goes faire *Samela*.
 Whiter than be the flockes that straggling feede,
 When washt by *Arethusa*, faint they lie.

I, 2; p. 133:

Serena commands Palemon not to pay further court to her.
 Palemon replies:

"Dear love,
 Recall this doom, and let me undergo
 Herculean labours."

Menaphon, p. 54:

Samela commands Melicertus: "I charge you . . . not to say
 any more as touching loue for this time." Melicertus replies: "If
 thou hadst enioyned me as *Iuno* did to *Hercules*, most daungerous
 labours . . ."

I, 2; p. 134:

Bar me my food—I'll like the Argive live
In contemplation of my mistress' beauty.

Menaphon, p. 36:

Menaphon, like the *Argive* in the Date gardens of *Arabia*,
liued with the contemplation of his Mistres beutie.

I, 2; p. 134:

Whereas the snickfail grows, and hyacinth;
The cowslip, primrose, and the violet,
Shall serve to make thee garlands for thy head.

Menaphon, p. 36:

There growes the cintfoyle, and the hyacinth, the cowsloppe, the
primrose, and the violet, which my flockes shall spare for flowers to
make thee garlands.

I, 2; p. 134:

I'll fetch Senessa from the down of swans.¹

Menaphon, p. 77:

Or like the downe of Swannes where *Senesse* wonnes.

I, 2; p. 134:

Thou shalt be guarded round with jolly swains,
Such as was Luna's love on Latmus' hill:
Thy music shall surpass the Argus-tamer.

Menaphon, p. 47:

I should bee garded from the foldes with iollie Swaines, such as
was *Lunas* Loue on the hills of Latmos; their pipes sounding like
the melodie of *Mercurie*, when he lulld asleepe *Argus*.

II, 2; p. 145:

In every corner here content sits smiling.

Menaphon, p. 33:

In euerie corner of the house Content sitting smiling. . . .

II, 2, p. 145:

The mountain tops I make my morning walks,
The evening shades my recreation.

Menaphon, p. 36:

The mountaine tops shall be thy mornings walke, and the shadie
valleies thy euenings arbour.

¹ "In common with Mr. Dyce, I am wholly unable to make sense of this line. I think I have seen the name *Senessa* as the appellation of a certain Druidess."—Hazlitt. *Qy*. Coined by Greene in his Euphuistic manner from *cygne*.

II, 2; p. 145, 146:

I take delight to gaze upon the stars,
In which, methinks, I read philosophy;
And by the astronomical aspects
I search out nature's secrets; the chief means
For the preventing my lamb's prejudice.
I tell you, sir, I find, in being a shepherd,
What many kings want in their royalties.

Menaphon, p. 24:

Thou art a shepherd *Menaphon*, who in feeding of thy flockes,
findest out natures secrecie, and in preuenting thy lambes preiudice
conceiptest the Astronomically motions of the heauens: holding thy
sheep-walkes to yeeld as great Philosophie, as the Ancients discourse
in their learned Academies . . . and by being a shepherd findest
that which Kings want in their royalties.

II, 3; p. 152 (the following is the oracle in *The Thracian Wonder*):

Content shall keep in town and field,
When Neptune from his waves shall yield
A Thracian Wonder; and as when
It shall be prov'd 'mongst Thracian men,
That lambs have lions to their guides,
And seas have neither ebbs nor tides;
Then shall a shepherd from the plain
Restore your health and crown again.

Menaphon, p. 22 (the following is the oracle in *Menaphon*):

When *Neptune* riding on the Southerne seas
shall from the bosome of his Lemman yeeld
Th' *arcadian* wonder,¹ men and Gods to please:
Plentie in pride shall march amidst the field,
Dead men shall warre, and vnborne babes shall frowne,
And with their fawchens hew their foemen downe.
When Lambes haue Lions for their surest guide,
and Planets rest vpon th' *arcadian* hills:
When swelling seas haue neither ebb nor tide,
When equall bankes the Ocean margine fills.
Then looke *Arcadians* for a happie time,
And sweete content within your troubled Clyme.

III, 1; p. 159:

Comets portend at first blaze, but take effect
Within the bosom of the destinies;
So oracles at Delphos though foretold,
Are shap'd and finish'd in your council-house.

¹ This clause, of course, suggested the title of the play.

Menaphon, p. 22:

. . . that Comets did portend at the first blaze, but tooke effect
in the dated bosome of the destinies; that oracles were foretold at
the *Delphian* Caue, but were shapte out and finished in the Counsell
house.

III, 1; p. 159:

And yet I charge you both upon your lives,
Let not the commons understand so much,
Lest several censures raise a mutiny.

Menaphon, p. 23:

. . . commanded by proclamation that no man should prie into
the quiddities of *Apollos* answere, least sundrie censures of his
diuine secrecie, should trouble *Arcadia* with some sodaine mutinie.

IV, 1; p. 173:

Sitting upon the plain,
I saw a face of such surpassing beauty,
That Jove and nature, should they both contend
To make a shape of their mix'd purity,
Could not invent a sky-born form so beautiful as she.

Menaphon, p. 52:

Not *Ioue* or Nature should they both agree
To make a woman of the Firmament,
Of his mixt puritie could not inuent
A Skie borne form so beautifull as she.

The fact that the author's debt to Greene has passed unnoticed
so long calls to mind the passage in Ben Jonson's *Every Man
out of his Humour*:¹

Fast. She does observe as pure a phrase, and use as choice figures
in her ordinary conferences, as any be in the *Arcadia*.

Car. Or rather in *Greenes* works, whence she may steal with more
security.

Greene himself complains, in his *Groat's Worth of Wit* (1592),
of "those puppets, who speak from our mouths, those anticks
garnisht in our colours." It is just possible that he included in
his attack the author of *The Thracian Wonder*.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N. Y.

¹This play was acted in 1599. Did Jonson have in mind the borrowings in *The Thracian Wonder*? If so, this goes to support Fleay's identification of the play with Heywood's *War without blows and Love without suit*, 1598.

THE ABYSSINIAN PARADISE IN COLERIDGE AND MILTON

In his *Poems of Coleridge*, p. 292, Dr. Garnett annotates the allusion to Abyssinia in *Kubla Khan* as follows:

L. 40. *Singing of Mount Abora*. There seems to be no mountain of this name in Abyssinia at the present day, though one may be mentioned by some ancient traveler. Whether this be the case, or whether the mountain be Coleridge's invention, the name must be connected with the river Atbara, the Astaboras of the ancients, which rises in Abyssinia and falls into the Nile near Berber. The principal affluent of this river is the Tacazze = *terrible*, so called from the impetuosity of its stream. If Coleridge knew this, an unconscious association with the impetuosity of the river he had been describing may have led to the apparently far-fetched introduction of the Abyssinian maid into a poem of Tartary.

Abora might be a variant spelling, not only of *Atbara*, but of *Amara* in some old itinerary or, say, in one of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century books that touch on the location of the paradise terrestrial. I have not, however, been able to find the variant in anything that Coleridge read. Presumably he read many both of the earlier and of the later travelers. One of the later, the best authority that he could have for his knowledge of Abyssinia, was James Bruce, whose *Travels to Discover the Sources of the Nile* fell into Coleridge's hand perhaps as early as 1794.¹ It is barely possible that Coleridge borrowed the book from Southey, for the latter's library in 1844 contained a copy of the Dublin (1790) edition. Bruce, of course, mentions the river *Astaboras* or *Atbara*, as well as *Atbara*, a peninsula, and *Amhara* (compare *Amara*), a "division of country." He speaks of the *Tacazzè* also, remarking on the contrast between its placidity at one season² and its turbulence when swollen with rain:

But three fathoms it certainly had rolled in its bed; and this prodigious body of water, passing furiously from a high ground in a very deep descent, tearing up rocks and large trees in its course, and forcing down

¹ Coleridge's *Poems*: Facsimile Reproduction, p. 173.

² Edinburgh edition (1790), Vol. III, p. 157.

their broken fragments scattered on its stream, with a noise like thunder echoed from a hundred hills, these very naturally suggest an idea, that, from these circumstances, it is very rightly called the *terrible*.¹

Some of the diction and imagery here reminds one of Coleridge's tumultuous river *Alph*. However, there is in general not enough of the fabulous about Bruce to warrant the supposition that Coleridge is indebted to him for much of *Kubla Khan*, full though that poem be of the spirit of the "old travellers." In any case, I cannot believe that Dr. Garnett has hit upon the "unconscious association" that brought Abyssinia into "a poem of Tartary."

For that matter, I cannot regard "poem of Tartary" as an entirely fitting name for Coleridge's sensuous vision. This might preferably be termed a dream of the terrestrial, or even of the "false," paradise; since, aside from its unworthy, acquiescent admission of demoniac love within so-called "holy" precincts,² it reads like an arras of reminiscences from several accounts of natural³ or enchanted parks, and from various descriptions of that elusive and danger-fraught garden which mystic geographers have studied to locate from Florida to Cathay.⁴ Like the Tartar paradise at the beginning of *Kubla Khan* and the bewitched inclosure of the Old Man of the Mountain which seems to appear toward the end,⁵ this Abyssinian hill in the middle is simply one of those "sumptuous" retreats whose allurements occupied the imagination of a marvel-hunter like Samuel Purchas. It is certainly not "Coleridge's invention." The Portuguese Alvarez passed by the mountain *Amara* in Abyssinia and was acquainted with the myth concerning it.⁶ Incidentally he speaks of a city

¹ Edinburgh edition (1790), Vol. III, p. 158.

² A savage place! as holy and enchanted
As e'er beneath a waning moon was haunted
By woman wailing for her demon-lover!

— *Kubla Khan*, ll. 14-16

³ For example, Bartram's descriptions of Georgia and Florida in his *Travels*, etc (Philadelphia, 1791).

⁴ See the authorities cited in Pierre Daniel Huet's *La situation du paradis terrestre* (Paris, 1711).

⁵ Compare Purchas his *Pilgrimage* (1617), p. 428.

⁶ See his account (chap. 54) in Ramusio.

in that region, called *Abra*, the name of which may in some way be connected with Coleridge's *Abora*.

However, if we do not demand unusual exactitude in the poet's handling of proper names, we need not go far afield to discover his mountain; no farther, in fact, than the volume which he says he was reading before he fell asleep and dreamed his *Kubla Khan*. Purchas has an entire chapter of his *Pilgrimage*, entitled "Of the Hill Amara," in which he has collected the substance of the stories about that fabulous spot. An excerpt or two from him may serve in identification:

The hill Amara hath alreadie been often mentioned, and nothing indeed in all Ethiopia more deserueth mention. . . . This hill is situate as the naui of that Ethiopian body, and center of their Empire, vnder the Equinoctiall line, where the Sun may take his best view thereof, as not encountering in all his long iourny with the like Theatre, wherein the Graces & Muses are actors, no place more graced with Natures store, . . . the Sunne himself so in loue with the sight, that the first & last thing he vieweth in all those parts is this hill. . . . Once, Heauen and Earth, Nature and Industrie, have all been corriualls to it, all presenting their best presents, to make it of this so louely presence, some taking this for the place of our Fore-fathers Paradise. And yet though thus admired of others, as a Paradise, it is made a Prison to some [i. e., the princes of Abyssinia], on whom Nature had bestowed the greatest freedome. . . .¹

This, then, is the *Mount Abora* of which Coleridge (or his slave-girl) sings, a paradise which he is led to compare with that of Tartary by the most intimate of mental associations. It is also the *Mount Amara* of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, occurring in a section of that poem with which I can fancy the author of *Kubla Khan* as especially familiar; in the fourth book, where Milton offers his marvelous description of the authentic paradise terrestrial, distinguishing it carefully from sundry false claimants:

Nor, where Abassin kings their issue guard,
Mount Amara (though this by some supposed
True Paradise) under the Ethiop line
By Nilus' head, enclosed with shining rock
A whole day's journey high, but wide remote
From this Assyrian garden. . . .²

¹ Purchas (1617), p. 843.

² *Paradise Lost*, Book IV, ll. 280-86.

When the industrious Todd¹ pointed out a connection between these lines and Purchas' chapter on Mount Amara, quoting the passage given below from the *Pilgrimage*, he failed to note that later on in the fourth book Milton had, in spite of his distinction, to all appearances levied on Purchas' description of the false Abyssinian garden for embellishment of the true "Assyrian." Purchas goes on with the account of his "hill."

It is situate in a great Plaine largely extending it selfe every way, without other hill in the same for the space of 30. leagues, the forme thereof round and circular, the height such, that it is a daies worke to ascend from the foot to the top; round about, the rock is cut so smooth and euen, without any vnequall swellings, that it seemeth to him that stands beneath, like a high wall, whereon the Heauen is as it were propped: and at the top it is over-hanged with rocks, iutting forth of the sides the space of a mile, bearing out like mushromes, so that it is impossible to ascend it. . . . It is above twenty leagues in circuit compassed with a wall on the top, well wrought, that neither man nor beast in chase may fall downe. The top is a plaine field, onely toward the South is a rising hill, beautifying this plaine, as it were with a watch-tower, not seruing alone to the eye, but yeelding also a pleasant spring which passeth through all that Plaine . . . and making a Lake, whence issueth a River, which hauing from these tops espied Nilus, never leaves seeking to find him, whom he cannot leave both to seeke and finde. . . . The way vp to it is cut out within the Rocke, not with staires, but ascending by little and little, that one may ride vp with ease; it hath also holes cut to let in light, and at the foote of this ascending place, a faire gate, with a *Corpus du Garde*. Halfe way vp is a faire and spacious Hall cut out of the same rocke, with three windowes very large vpwards: the ascent is about the length of a lance and a halfe: and at the top is a gate with another gard. . . . There are no Cities on the top, but palaces, standing by themselves, in number four and thirtie, spacious, sumptuous, and beautifull, where the Princes of the Royall bloud have their abode with their Families. The Souldiers that gard the place dwell in Tents.²

This sunlit and symmetrical hill, with its miracle of inner carven passages, may partially explain Coleridge's "sunny dome" and "caves of ice" (why of ice?) which must have puzzled more than one reader in *Kubla Khan*. The preceding lines from Milton should also be compared, and, as I have hinted, the following as well:

¹ *Milton's Poetical Works*, ed. Todd (1809), Vol. III, pp. 101, 102.

² Purchas (1617), p. 844.

. . . the setting Sun
 Slowly descended, and with right aspect
 Against the eastern gate of Paradise
 Levelled his evening rays. It was a rock
 Of alabaster, piled up to the clouds,
 Conspicuous far, winding with one ascent
 Accessible from Earth, one entrance high;
 The rest was craggy cliff, that overhung
 Still as it rose, impossible to climb.
 Betwixt these rocky pillars Gabriel sat,
 Chief of the angelic guards . . .¹

There are, it is true, too many points of similarity in the various paradises of The Fathers and geographers to permit the critic to say with great assurance that Milton or Coleridge borrowed this or that embellishment of his mystical inclosure from any one prior writer. We are dealing here, I presume, with a world-old effort of imagination showing certain reappearing essentials of an inherited conception, such as a fountain with outflowing "sinuous rills," a symmetrical mountain, a disappearing "sacred river," all within a wall of measured circuit, and the like, the chief of which may be found in a poem of small compass like *Kubla Khan*²—probably all of them in the fourth book of *Paradise Lost*. In how far Milton may be indebted to Purchas' compendium for all sorts of quasi-geographical lore, in addition to the slight obligations already indicated, is a question lying rather in the province of the professed student of Milton. For the present writer, whose interest here is more particularly in Coleridge, it seems enough to point out the relationship between Coleridge's beautiful fragment and Milton's completed masterpiece; to indicate, in passing, Milton's greater distinctness and mastery in handling his material; finally, to suggest, on the basis of this brief paper, that, instead of continuing to treat *Kubla Khan* as a sort of incomparable *hapax legomenon*, wholly unexplainable, because

¹ *Paradise Lost*, Book IV, ll. 540-49.

² Compare, for example, Coleridge's "mighty fountain," "sinuous rills," and "meandering" river with the following, quoted by Todd: "In ipso hortorum apice fons est eximius, qui primùm argenteis aquarum vorticibus ebulliens, mox diffusus in fluvium sinuosis flexibus, atque meandris concisus oberrat, et felicia arva pœrennibus fecundat rivulis."—P. Causinus, *de Elog.*, lib. XI., edit. 1634 (Todd, *Milton's Poetical Works* [1809], Vol. III, pp. 95, 96). Cf. Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Book IV, ll. 223 ff., and the first part of *Kubla Khan*.

incomparable, we shall understand it and its author better if we seek to trace the subtle, yet no less real, connection between them and the literature to which they belong. Specifically, let the reader of Coleridge be also a reader of Coleridge's master, Milton, and the lover of *Kubla Khan* a lover also of that "pleasant soil" in which "his far more pleasant garden God ordained."¹

LANE COOPER.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

¹ *Paradise Lost*, Book IV, l. 215.

AN OBSCURE PASSAGE IN DANTE'S "PURGATORY"

Sicura, quasi rocca in alto monte,
 Seder sopr' esso una puttana sciolta
 M' apparve con le ciglia intorno pronte:
 E, come perchè non gli fosse tolta,
 Vidi di costa a lei dritto un gigante,
 E baciavansi insieme alcuna volta.
 Ma, perchè l'occhio cupido e vagante
 A me rivolse, quel feroce drudo
 La flagellò dal capo infin le piante.
 Poi, di sospetto pieno e d'ira crudo,
 Disciolse il mostro, e trassel per la selva
 Tanto, che sol di lei mi fece scudo
 Alla puttana ed alla nuova belva.

—*Purg.*, xxxii, 148-60.

The general meaning of this passage may be fairly considered as accepted. The harlot seated upon the car of the church is the degenerate papacy (or a special pope), and the giant typifies the kings of France (or a special king). They caress each other in forming alliances. But when the harlot turns her eyes on Dante, her fierce lover scourges her, and afterward drags her away through the wood from out Dante's sight. This latter is also commonly accepted as indicating the removal of the seat of the papacy to Avignon.

The disagreement in interpretation comes in the meaning of the harlot turning her eyes on Dante. Mr. Norton, in the note to this passage in the last edition of his translation, says: "The meaning . . . is obscure, and no satisfactory interpretation of it has been proposed;" and Dr. Moore in his *Studies*¹ passes over the phrase.

Leaving out of consideration the hopelessly indeterminate solutions, the explanations offered may be brought into three divisions; viz., that the papacy was looking longingly toward (a) men of worth, or the Christian people; (b) the Italian people; (c) the other rulers, his (Philip's) enemies, or the Ghibellines.

¹ Vol. III, pp. 206, 209.

The first two explanations do not satisfy us on account of their vagueness. Philip could hardly object to the pope's having to do with honorable men or Christian peoples, as long as this did not interfere with his own plans. Still more could the people of Italy be expected to draw the pope's attention; and if Philip were sure of the pope, he would hardly be likely to object to this. Our dissatisfaction with the previous explanations loses much of its strength when applied to the third class. Philip's (or the French) plans would be seriously hindered if the papacy were to turn toward the other princes, his enemies, the Ghibellines. But Dante expressly says *a me*, and he never takes himself elsewhere as the representative of princes. Still here he does make himself enter into the allegory; so we must find some meaning for the personal element introduced, and yet one which shall be in consonance with the historical bearing of the passage in question.

The whole allusion is evidently a political one. Now, what was Dante's position? He was never against the theoretical papacy, but only against the debased and debauched popes of his times. He was fiercely opposed to the house of France, because it was debasing the papacy and because it was working against that Holy Roman Empire which meant so much to Dante during the time when this passage must have been written. He may have already composed his *De Monarchia*, although this is of slight bearing on the case. Still Dante, while holding to his theoretical date of 1300, was not averse to looking ahead and to utilizing his subsequent knowledge. Coming back to the time probably indicated in the passage under consideration; if we are to consider that the end of the canto marks the year 1305, then we must consider Dante's condition prior to that time. Even if his political importance has been unduly emphasized by some writers, it is nevertheless a fact that he took no inconsiderable part in the politics of Florence from 1298 to 1302. He may have gone to Rome in the Jubilee year; he may or may not have gone later as an ambassador to the pope; at all events, he steadfastly opposed the pretensions of the pope at Florence. For a time after his exile he worked with the Ghibellines, until he saw the hopelessness of the lines along which they were struggling.

Moreover, Dante took himself very seriously. He was a deep thinker, he held definite and healthy political views, and he knew it. He earnestly wanted these views to triumph, and he was insistent in expressing, and desirous of imposing, them, as is shown by his own words, and especially by his letters at the time of the descent of Henry of Luxemburg. Such a man occupies a large position in his own world—larger, perhaps, than in the world as seen by others.

With these ideas in view, and taking into consideration the explanations already proposed, may we not see in the harlot's turning her eyes upon Dante a tendency of the papacy to accept the political ideas advocated by him, and at least a movement toward them? Dante does not use a phrase which would indicate that much advance was necessarily made, simply *l'occhio a me rivolse*—a preparatory step, but one fraught with hopeful possibilities. Now, to what historical fact, or facts, can this refer?

If we accept the usual interpretation of the scourging as indicating the affair of Anagni, Dante evidently alludes to the facts which led up to it, which were as follows: Albert was elected emperor of Germany in 1298, and when Boniface VIII denied his right, asserting his own supremacy, Albert took up arms and compelled the archbishop of Mayence, a former ally of the pope, to make an alliance with him (Albert). This forced the pope's hand, and he soon came to an understanding with Albert, to whom he offered the headship of the Holy Roman Empire in 1303, in return for Albert's protection; also excommunicating Philip, with whom he had a serious quarrel. Philip then took immediate action in conjunction with the Colonna family and Boniface was arrested in Anagni.

That Dante looked upon "Alberto Tedesco" as a hope of the imperial party, and as the man that his own ideals demanded, is shown in the powerful appeal in *Purg.*, VI, 97-117; and any recognition of him by the papacy would be a step in the right direction. The news that Boniface had entered into an agreement with Albert, and would crown him emperor, would, therefore, seem to justify Dante's phrase—both in its personal and in its historical bearing. The question of Dante's theoretical equal

balance would be of importance ultimately; for the present it would be sufficient that the pope had broken away from France and had acknowledged the empire.

Some objection has been raised to considering the scourging as indicating the episode of Anagni. Whether this be considered valid or not (and it generally is not), it suggests another explanation for the words under consideration, and one which gives even a more personal interpretation to the *a me*.

It is clear that the harlot cannot typify Boniface VIII during the whole episode; for between his death and the removal of the papacy to Avignon two other popes had been chosen—Benedict XI and Clement V. There is, then, no reason why one of these others should not be referred to, if the circumstances permit of it. Indeed, it would be quite in consonance with the Dantesque structure, assuming that lines 151–53 referred to Boniface VIII, and lines 157–60 to Clement V, that the central *terzina* should refer to the central one of the popes of the period, Benedict XI. Let us examine the events of the short tenure of this pope.

On October 22, 1303, Niccolò Boccasino was elected pope, taking the name of Benedict XI. He was a just, conscientious, and holy man, desirous of bringing peace to the world, and of making the papacy what it should be—the source of peace and good-will. He found ample occasion near at hand in Rome and Florence, the two plague spots of Italian politics. Neglecting Rome, the conditions in Florence are well known. The Blacks were intrenched in power, and the Whites exiled. Desirous of reconciling the two factions, Benedict sent the cardinal Niccolò da Prato to Florence. While things promised well at first, and it looked as if the Whites might be allowed to return, the Ultra-Blacks precipitated matters, and the cardinal was forced to return to his master.

We know the importance that this had for Dante; we can imagine that it filled a large part in his thoughts for many days; and we have a remembrance of it in the much-discussed letter to the cardinal, Niccolò da Prato.¹ And yet apparently Dante has

¹ A late and full discussion as to the genuineness of this letter will be found in *Dante e Firenze*, Zenatti (Sansoni), pp. 343–430.

not indicated Benedict XI in the *Divina Commedia*, unless he refers to him here. The efforts of the papacy to effect the return of the banished Whites, of whom Dante considered himself not the least, would be precisely what we might expect to find mentioned here, and the personal element of the allusion would be even more applicable here than in the broader field of world-politics. In turning his eyes upon the banished Whites, the pope would be turning them upon Dante in person.

Will the rest of the *terzina* bear out this interpretation? What was the scourging from head to foot, the completest of punishments wreaked upon the papacy?

On July 7, 1304, Benedict died, of poison it is generally believed; and such was certainly the belief in Dante's day. So, when we find a contemporary chronicler, Ferreto di Vicenza, recording that Benedict XI died, poisoned by order of Philip of France, we have all necessary to complete this interpretation of Dante's phrase. Later historical research may or may not confirm the exactness of his assertion;¹ it is sufficient for us that it was current at the time. It may also be true that, if Benedict did die poisoned by Philip, the reason would be found rather in the political situation at Rome. But the pope's death, coming, as it did, about a month after the failure of the cardinal to pacify Florence, might well have been closely connected in Dante's mind with this attempted pacification, and would have been the completest of scourgings.

These two explanations are presented as suggestions for a closer and more personal interpretation of lines 154 and 155.

F. M. JOSSELYN, JR.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

¹ It does not seem to have been generally held as a fact, Ferreto being the only chronicler who asserts it. Cf. Gautier, *Benott XI* (Tours, 1876), pp. 222-27.

THE DIFFERENCES IN THE MIDDLE ENGLISH "ROMAUNT OF THE ROSE" AND THEIR BEARING UPON CHAUCER'S AUTHORSHIP

Kaluza's theory that Chaucer never translated more of the *Rommanz de la Rose* than the existing fragments A and C is in conflict with the evidence contained in the Prologue of the *Legend of Good Women* (ll. 322-31, Later Version, Skeat's edition), where the god of love reproaches Chaucer with having translated the *Rommanz*,¹ in these words:

And thou my fo, and al my folk werreyest,
And of myn olde servaunts thou misseyest,
And hindrest hem, with thy translacioun,
And lettest folk from hir devocioun
To serve me, and holdest hit folye
To serve Love. Thou mayst hit nat denye;
For in pleyn text, withouten nede of glose,
Thou hast translated the Romaunce of the Rose,
That is an heresyge ageyns my lawe,
And makest wyse folk fro me withdrawe.

This certainly does not refer to the existing fragments A and C, which do not hinder lovers or hold it folly to serve love. Under the allegory, Fragment A contains nothing but a playful account of a young man enjoying life in his youth, and finally being about to fall in love when the fragment ends. Fragment C is directed against hypocrisy and the begging friars, but is decidedly favorable to the lover and the god of love. In this Fragment C, "Richesse" is severely blamed for refusing to help the lover because he is poor, and the dominant note of the fragment is "Doun shal the castel every del"—the castle in which "Ielousye" had imprisoned "Faire-Welcoming." These objections to his translation of the *Rommanz*, which Chaucer puts into the mouth of the god of love, certainly apply to no part of the extant

¹ *Rommanz* indicates *li Rommanz de la Rose*, and the ME translation is referred to as the *Romaunt*. The line-numbering employed throughout this paper is that of Kaluza for the *Rommanz*, and that of Skeat for the *Romaunt*.

Romaunt, but Fragment B, in which a long enumeration of the woes of lovers is given by the god of love, and the lover is sorely mistreated by "Wikked-Tunge," "Daunger," and "Ielousye," and harangued by Dame "Resoun" for over a thousand lines on the folly of love and the preferable character of friendship.

To anyone who has in mind the contents of the different fragments, Chaucer's own words cited above must convey the conviction that his translation did include more than the extant fragments A and C. But whether the extant Fragment B is the one he translated or not is another question. The point made here is not new, but is worth insisting on because of Kaluza's disregard of it in setting up his hypothesis. Ten Brink, as far back as 1867,¹ mentioned this evidence as to Chaucer's having paid fully as much attention to translating the later satirical part of the *Rommanz* as to the earlier portion of Guillaume de Lorris.

Lindner and Lounsbury have mentioned the mistranslation:

For thou shalt for this sinne dwelle
Right in the *devils ers* of helle, (7578)

from

Vous en irés ou *puis* d'enfer. (12422)

Lounsbury considered this a proof of Chaucerian authorship, for the translator seems to have had in mind Chaucer's *Somnour's Prologue* in writing this passage, which has nothing in the original to suggest it. Later, Kaluza thought he disposed of this discrepancy between the original and the translation by finding that most of the manuscripts of the *Rommanz* which he examined read:

Vous en irés ou *cul* d'enfer.

It seems, however, that the last word has not been said about this. Whether the translator's original read *cul d'enfer* or *puis d'enfer* really makes no particular difference; the one meant "bottom of hell" and the other "pit of hell." There is a mistranslation in either case. Kaluza makes the same mistake as the translator of Fragment C did. He overlooks the fact that *cul* in OF as well as in modern French, besides indicating a part of the body, was a very common term for the bottom of any object or cavity. The

¹ *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Literatur*, Vol. VII, pp. 313, 314.

original text meant nothing but "You'll go to the bottom of hell," no matter which reading we adopt. In Godefroy's dictionary this very passage is given as an instance of *cul* meaning simply "bottom" in general. We find a similar reference to the "bottom of hell" in other words in the *Mystère d'Adam*:¹ "d'emfer m'estoet tempter le fond." Lounsbury's point is well taken. We have, however, an instance of *cul* meaning a part of the body in a passage of the original of Fragment B:

Tout li megre du cul lor tremble. (3626)

B was careful to avoid a literal translation:

Bothe Drede and she ful sore quook; (3966)

There are several other interesting specimens of mistranslation.

Lors leva li vilains la hure (3711)

is translated by

With that the cherl his clubbe gan shake. (4061)

The original says that the ruffian then stood his hair (*hure*) on end. The word *hure* seems to have been unknown to the translator; and he took it to mean "clubbe" from the context.

Qui nuit et jor sourt a grans ondes
Par deux *doiz* creuses et parfondes (1524)

is translated:

That welmeth up with wawes brighte
The mountance of two *finger* highte. (1562)

Here the translator confused *doiz* from *ductos* with *doiz* from *digitos*. Perhaps he did not know that there were two different words having the same form (similar to the two uses of *cul* which he mistook). Or he may have noticed that the word in the text was the one meaning "tubes;" then, by a common psychological process, the other word *doiz* meaning "fingers" suggested itself unsought, and a phrase formed itself about this last word "finger" in the poet's mind. This phrase he considered good enough to put into his translation. We are not justified in concluding that the translator's knowledge of (continental) French was at fault, though it may have been. It

¹ Bartsch's *Chrestomathie*, 6th ed., p. 94, l. 28.

would be a capital point if it could be shown that such mistranslations through ignorance (?) of the language of the original were confined to any particular fragment of the poem; but this does not seem to be the case. It is not worth while to attempt to make a complete collection of data covering the phenomenon, because of the impossibility of deciding whether the words in question were really mistranslated because the translator did not know his French well enough or whether he altered them for other reasons, such as the need of making correct metre and rimes, or because he thought it would improve the passage to change it.

To prove that such cases are really mistranslations through ignorance of (continental) French, it would be necessary to have repeated instances of the same mistake made by the same translator. Such a case seems really to occur in Fragment B. The translator of this part seems to have really misunderstood the adverb *espoir*, confusing it with the noun *espoir* which meant "hope," though the adverb was always used in OF with the meaning "perhaps." This adverb occurs 7 times in the original of B. It is translated once "as I hope" (*Rommanz*, l. 2018); once, "I hope" (l. 4039); once, "I trowe" (l. 4164); and 4 times (in the passages corresponding to *Rommanz*, ll. 2037, 4965, 4993, 5002) it has no one word corresponding to it in the translation. But we have evidence that C did not misunderstand this adverb *espoir*. He translated it once properly by "percas" (l. 11517); once by "redily" (l. 11816); and omitted it once (l. 11926). The word does not occur in the original of A.

A methodical search fails to reveal any more instances of variation between the different fragments in the translation of single words, such as the varying translation of the names of "Bel-Acueil" and the "Bouton" already observed. The vocabulary of the different fragments differs so much, owing to the different subjects treated, that very few words occur in all three sections, aside from the commonest words which are necessarily found in any and all books. Here is a splendid opportunity for someone to prove a difference of authorship of the different fragments by a "vocabulary test"! There is, of course,

some variation in the translation of single words, but it is indiscriminate and does not coincide with any division of the poem into fragments. Fragment B shows more variation in this respect than the other fragments, but this may be due to the greater length of Fragment B, and the consequent greater ease of finding variations among the greater amount of data this fragment offers.

The "Dous-Parlers" of *Rommanz*, ll. 2655, 2743, 4098, is translated "Swete-Speche," but the same character of l. 2667 appears in the translation as "Swete-Speking." "Swete-Speking" makes bad metre in the last instance, but it is necessary to the rime; the first two cases of translation by "Swete-Speche" also occur in rimes. There is a similar variation in the translation of "Douls-Pensers" in *Rommanz*, ll. 2629, 2633, 2742, 4097, by "Swete-Thought," while the same character in *Rommanz*, l. 2645, is translated as "Swete-Thenking." Compare the uniform translation of "Dous-Regars" throughout both A and B as "Swete-Loking." These variations are, it will be noticed, all in Fragment B.

The occasional confusion of a group of words in B is also worthy of remark. One of these groups is *diex*, *amors*, and *diex d'amors*; the other is *boutons*, *rose*, and *rosiers*. In A we never find the words of these groups translated otherwise than literally. But in B these words are sometimes substituted for one another in translating. In B, *diex d'amors* is translated simply "love" in four instances (corresponding to *Rommanz*, ll. 4095, 4112, 4149, 4170), though in 8 other instances it appears as "god of love," as we should expect. Similarly, *diex* though translated "god" in 17 instances in B, is also translated "love" in one instance (corresponding to *Rommanz*, l. 4324) in which *diex d'amors* is meant, but not verbally stated. B also translated *diex* in one instance by "lord"! (*Rommanz*, l. 2475), probably to avoid monotony, as "A! god!" occurs a few lines lower. B generally translated *amors* by "love," but in 7 instances (at the places corresponding to *Rommanz*, ll. 1829, 1837, 2749, 2988, 2999, 3484, 4591) he substituted "the god of love." Scattering instances in B of other trans-

lations of *amors* are: "loving" (corresponding to ll. 2260, 4330); "freendship" (corresponding to l. 4705); "lovers" (corresponding to l. 2658); and "paramours" corresponding to *par amors*, in ll. 4234, 4374), the only analogy in the other fragments to the confusion of this group of words being an isolated instance in Fragment C, where *dieu d'amors* (l. 10702) is translated "love," and perhaps the 3 instances in C where *diex* (ll. 12048, 12083, 12084) is translated "Crist" or "Jesus Crist."

The words of the other group (*boutons*, *rose*, and *rosiers*) were never confused by the translator of Fragment A. None of these words occur in the original of Fragment C, except *rose* which occurs only 3 times and is translated literally in each instance; C must therefore be left out of consideration. In B there is considerable confusion of the words of this group. *Boutons* appears translated "botoun" 19 times; it is also translated "rose" 2 times (*Rommanz*, ll. 1771, 1791). *Rose* is translated literally 23 times; it also appears "botoun" once (l. 3751), and as "roser" 5 times (corresponding to ll. 2783, 2816, 2831, 2843, 2907). This substitution of "roser" for "rose(s)" occurs in a rime only in the last instance mentioned. It is therefore possible that the other instances are copyists' blunders; for if these translations by "roser" were amended to "rose(s)," neither the metre nor the sense of the passages would be disturbed, and a closer correspondence with the original would be secured. *Rosiers* is translated by B 8 times literally, and 4 times by "roses" (*Rommanz*, ll. 1793, 3009, 3783, 3925). It is possible that these four substitutions are also the work of copyists, and that the correct reading is "roser(s)."

A differs strikingly from the other fragments in invariably translating the French *diex* by "god" wherever it occurs (*Rommanz* ll. 40, 440, 492, 776, 1005, 1130, 1307, 1450, 1460, 1502). In the original of Fragment B *diex* occurs 42 times; the word is either omitted from the translation or a direct translation avoided in 22 out of these 42 instances (in the places corresponding to *Rommanz* ll. 2302, 2487, 2665, 2710, 2829, 2908, 3023, 3237, 3372, 3488, 3548, 3869, 3900, 4014, 4031, 4057, 4093, 4100, 4634, 4666, 4799, 4870); while it is translated by "god," "lord,"

or "love" in the passages corresponding to *Rommanz*, ll. 1891, 2033, 2289, 2475, 2477, 2970, 3228, 3351, 3375, 3891, 4149, 4170, 4174, 4324, 4441, 4670, 5005, 5047, 5103, 5108. In the original of Fragment C *diex* occurs 38 times; the word is either omitted or a direct translation of it avoided in 15 out of these 38 instances (viz., in the passages corresponding to *Rommanz*, ll. 11128, 11184, 11551, 11556, 11558, 11648, 11683, 11823, 12176, 12340, 12362, 12445, 12481, 12505, 12528); while it is translated by "god," "Crist," or "Jesus Crist" in the other 23 instances (occurring in *Rommanz*, ll. 10857, 10896, 11186, 11308, 11309, 11409, 11418, 11433, 11450, 11462, 11476, 11523, 11574, 11678, 11680, 12048, 12083, 12084, 12090, 12091, 12132, 12151, 12437).

In the last half of Fragment B there are departures from the original in the gender of several of the characters. I have not noticed any similar deviation in the other sections of the poem.

"Jalousie" is invariably referred to as feminine in the original; pronouns, articles, and inflectional endings indicate its gender in *Rommanz*, ll. 3510, 3511, 3512, 3548, 3582, 3584, 3597, 3622, 3699, 3700, 3704, 3781, 3893, 3918, 3919, 3920, 3921, 3923, 3927, 3987, 3989, 3990, 3997, 4000. In the *Romaunt*, however, "Ielousye" is invariably masculine, as is shown by pronouns, etc., in ll. 3821, 3822, 3823, 3870, 3964, 4049, 4050, 4053, 4148, 4204, 4302, 4304, 4305, 4306, 4307, 4308, 4313, 4314, 4381, 4383, 4384, 4392. Outside of the second half of B, "Jalousie" occurs only once (*Rommanz*, l. 12411), and there is no indication of its gender there either in the original or in the translation.

"Paor" is always referred to as feminine in the *Rommanz* (ll. 3619, 3620, 3629, 3860, 3864, 3866). "Drede," its translation, is referred to in *Romaunt*, ll. 3960, 3961, 3962, 3968, 3969 as masculine; but several hundred lines further on in *Romaunt*, ll. 4216, 4217, 4222, 4225, 4226, it is always feminine. This character is mentioned only once outside of the last half of Fragment B (in *Rommanz* C, l. 10749), and there no indication of the gender is to be found either in the original or in the translation.

As the double negatives *ne pas*, *ne point*, and *ne mie* were frequently used in the *Rommanz de la Rose*, but had not yet become obligatory in the language of that time, it is possible that the different translators may have treated them differently. One of the translators may have had a feeling for these double negatives as such. A complete collection of data covering the translation of these double negatives shows, however, that none of the translators had any habitual way of treating them.

Putting together the three categories of double negatives mentioned above, we find: A translated 11 out of 45 instances by a double negative or intensifying word or phrase; B, 22 out of 131; C, 12 out of 72. A gave 1 out of 4 special treatment; B and C, 1 out of 6 each.

Agreement on such a point is what we should rather expect, and is of no particular consequence, for different authors would probably not differ much in a matter like this. A marked divergence in the treatment of double negatives in different parts of the poem would, however, if it existed, be a strong indication of difference of authorship.

An investigation of the accuracy with which the different translators translated exact numbers shows that the numerals above 2 were accurately translated by A 18 times out of a possible 24; by B 11 times out of a possible 18; and by C 7 times out of a possible 15. Three of the 8 cases not properly translated by C are substitutions of another number for the one in the original. A further examination of the 7 cases correctly translated in Fragment C reveals the fact that in all the cases but one in which C accurately translated the numerals he did so simply because he could not avoid it. These 6 unavoidable cases are:

Neïs les onze mile vierges, (11127)
The eleven thousand maydens dere, (6247)

Tout droit ou trentiesme chapitre: (11408)
In his [thrittethe] chapitre right: (6532)

En l'an de l'Incarnacion (11964)
Mil et deus cens cinc et cinquante,
The yeer of the incarnacioun (7096)

A thousand and two hundred yeer,
Fyve and fifty, ferther ne ner,

Lor batailles en quatre partent: (12200)
And foure batels they gañ make, (7348)

Si s'en vont en quatre parties (12201)
And parted hem in foure anoon, (7349)

Por assaillir les quatre portes (12202)
The foure gates for to assaile, (7351)

The first example is a reference to the well-known mediæval legend of the eleven thousand virgins. This number the translator could not change or omit without spoiling the tradition. The second case is an exact reference to the number of the chapter from which a biblical citation appearing in the text is taken; this the translator could not change. The third case is an exact date, the year 1255, the date of the appearance of the *Evangile Pardurable* in Paris. Obviously the translator could not change this either. As to the other three examples: We have been told earlier in the story that "Ielousye" had a square castle built about the "Roser," with a gate on each side and guards at all four gates. Now we come to a passage where it is said that the party about to take the castle divide their forces in *four*, and go forth in *four* parties to assail the *four* gates. These numbers could not be changed or omitted without changing the story, and the translator had to follow copy again, in spite of his evident habit of avoiding an accurate translation of numerals where he could. It would be desirable to have more examples of this in C on which to base a conclusion, but the translator's tendency is pretty evident from what we have.

There are also a few cases in the other fragments where the translator could not avoid translating numbers accurately. The numerals referring to the ten arrows of the god of love, five of them corresponding to each of his two bows, are a necessary part of the story. Though one or two of these cases may be omitted, as they are, in fact, twice in A, yet it would be impossible for the translator to omit all of them or change them all, without changing the story. After all such cases are deducted, we find that 12 of

the 18 cases in which A translated numerals correctly were cases in which he could have avoided an accurate translation if he had cared to do so; and, similarly, 10 of the 11 cases B translated literally were also avoidable ones. The habit of A and B of translating higher numbers correctly is further attested by their generally accurate translation of *deus* (two). A translated *deus* properly 9 times out of 12, and B 3 times out of 5; in the original of C the word does not occur.

Kaluza has published some general statistics showing the frequency with which the riming words of the original are retained in different parts of the translation. A further investigation of the treatment of particular riming terminations shows that the translators had each a noticeable fondness for retaining certain terminations in preference to others. Such a comparison should include only terminations occurring in both languages frequently. And it is not the absolute number of such riming terminations retained by the translator which is of importance, but rather the relative number compared with the total number which the original contains and which he might have retained. After discarding the data relating to riming terminations which were not found to occur often enough to permit of drawing valid conclusions from them, ten common terminations remained: OF *-esse* (< Lat. *-issam*, *-itiam*), *-age* (< Lat. *-aticum*), *-able* (< Lat. *-abilem*), *-ure* (< Lat. *-ura*), *-ise* (< Lat. *-itium*, *-itiam*), *-eus(e)* (< Lat. *-osam*, *-osum*), *-ie* (< Lat. *-ia*), *-on* (< Lat. *-onem*), *-ance(s)*, *-ence* (< Lat. *-antiam*, *-entiam*), and *-tiē*, *-tē* (< Lat. *-tatem*). Whenever a rime in the original with one or both terminations of the etymology here mentioned has corresponding to it in the translation a rime with one or both terminations of the same etymology (viz.: ME *-esse* [or *-nesse* < OE *-nes(se)*], *-age*, *-able*, *-ure*, *-yse*, *-ous*, *-y(e)*, *-oun*, *-aunce(s)* or *-ence(s)*, and *-tee*), then the rime is regarded as retained whether the riming words are identical or not. To keep the inquiry within bounds and make sure of the possibility of retaining the same rimes, terminations identical phonetically with the ones above mentioned, but of different etymology, are not considered.

Of the *-esse* rimes A retained 7 out of 8; B, 8 out of 12; and

C, 8 out of 9. The treatment of this group of rimes is substantially the same in all three sections of the poem.

Of the *-age* rimes A retained 8 out of 10; B, 11 out of 19; and C, 5 out of 11. This rime seems to have been more of a favorite with A than with B or C.

Of the *-able* rimes A retained 4 out of 6; B, 9 out of 11; and C, 9 out of 10. This rime is nearly always retained throughout the poem.

Of the *-ure* rimes A retained 8 out of 16; B, 7 out of 28; and C, 7 out of 10. We see that this rime was generally kept by C, but avoided by B, while the position of A is neutral.

Of the *-ise* rimes A retained 4 out of 8; B, 15 out of 17; and C, the only one which there was in that section of the original. B differs from A in keeping nearly all these rimes that he could.

Of the *-eus(e)* rimes A retained 7 out of 13; B, 11 out of 23; and C, 10 out of 13. C differs from the other fragments in retaining a larger proportion of these rimes.

Of the *-ie* rimes A retained 12 out of 13; B, 18 out of 27; and C, 6 out of 17. A shows a remarkable fondness for this rime; B also generally keeps it; but C avoids it.

Of the rimes in *-on* A retained 8 out of 12; B, 18 out of 35; and C, 11 out of 22. A had a greater tendency to retain these rimes than the others had; while B and C kept about half of theirs.

Of the rimes in *-ance(s)*, *-ence(s)* A retained 6 out of 12; B, 23 out of 33; and C, 19 out of 33. B had a more marked preference for these rimes than either of the other translators.

Of the rimes *-tié*, *-té* A retained 8 out of 13; B, 17 out of 40; and C, 11 out of 20. There is no very striking difference here, though A retained this class of rimes slightly more frequently than the others did.

Interlinear padding, or the insertion of one entire line of matter between two lines of matter fairly closely translated from the original, occurs with different frequency in the different fragments. This extra line added by the translator on his own account is generally either an amplification of the adjacent lines or simply stereotyped phrases. The translation would be more literal, and would make just as good sense, if the padding had been left out,

but there would be no rimes at the places in question. The extra line seems to have been added for the sake of forming a couplet with one of the adjacent lines, and thus gaining a rime.

There are some interesting cases where a pair of alternate lines is thus introduced for padding, as in:

Si le baés a conchiër. (2919)	For thou wolt shame him, if thou might,
	Bothe ageyn resoun and right.
Ne me quier mes en vous fiër;	I wol no more in thee affye,
	That comest so slyghly for tespye;
Car bien est ores esprouvée	For it preveth wonder wel, (3157)

This occurs as follows: *Romaunt*, ll. 2698+2700, 3132+3134, 3154+3156 (quoted), 4261+4263, 4722+4724, 4980+4982, 5097+5099, 5248+5250, 7202+7204. All of these instances occur in Fragment B, except the last pair, which is in C.

The commonest kind of interlinear padding is the isolated insertion of a single line between two lines properly translated, as in:

Romaunt A: 36, 172, 238, 336, 365, 430, 532, 580, 624, 688, 709, 728, 777, 811, 828, 950, 1096, 1114, 1142, 1147, 1212, 1284, 1294, 1322, 1342, 1378, 1386, 1420, 1434, 1480, 1528, 1618, 1624, 1646, 1700.

Romaunt B: 1766, 1773, 1783, 1801, 1846, 1853, 1897, 1906, 1915, 1921, 1938, 1950, 1980, 2036, 2039, 2042, 2138, 2151, 2236, 2340, 2442, 2528, 2548, 2574, 2650, 2731, 2740, 2842, 2944, 2953, 2978, 3121, 3125, 3176, 3185, 3198, 3230, 3312, 3316, 3378, 3391, 3396, 3409, 3466, 3632, 3686, 3827, 3941, 3992, 4046, 4122, 4125, 4235, 4460, 4601, 4631, 4642, 4708, 4712, 4746, 4829, 4859, 4883, 4894, 4905, 5041, 5078, 5156, 5197, 5262, 5424, 5574, 5586, 5611, 5776.

Romaunt C: 6037, 6088, 6128, 6263, 6363, 6370, 6546, 6551, 6892, 7126, 7142, 7154, 7272, 7322, 7374, 7395, 7522, 7599, 7618, 7622.

Putting together all the cases of interlinear padding, both the isolated cases and the pairs of alternate lines inserted, we find there are 35 cases of interlinear padding in A in 1,705 lines; 91 cases in B in 4,105 lines; and 22 cases in C in 1,888 lines. We see that the phenomenon is about twice as frequent in Fragments A and B as in C.

Sometimes, instead of inserting a line on his own account, the translator substituted a line of different matter for the line in his original. This was seemingly done for the same purpose of making the rimes come out right. For example:

Quant elz requeurent lor martires;	Whan thy resseyved martirdom, (6251)
N'encor n'en sont el mie pires.	And wonnen heven unto her hoom.
Bons cuers fait la pensee bone, (11131)	Good herte makith the gode thought;

Such interlinear substitutions occur in the *Romaunt* as follows:

A (6 times in 1,705 lines): 222, 406, 632, 718, 1090, 1181.

B (21 times in 4,105 lines): 1713, 1824, 1874, 2049, 2182, 2422, 2983, 3252, 3302, 3502, 3604, 4012, 4354, 4386, 4419, 4512, 4568, 5072, 5313, 5462, 5519.

C (18 times in 1,888 lines): 6252, 6353, 6359, 6464, 6648, 6666, 6767, 6827, 6888, 7049, 7071, 7094, 7118, 7328, 7591, 7636, 7684, 7697.

We see that the translator of C resorted to this expedient three times as frequently as the translator of A, and twice as often as did the translator of B.

Fragment B shows a number of instances of simplification of repetitions which appear in the original, and repetition of matter which is not repeated in the original. Repetitions of one line or less appear, it is true, occasionally throughout the translation. Only cases in which the matter repeated amounts to two lines or more are here considered. The repetitions do not always correspond closely in words, but they do in sense.

Three repetitions existing in the *Rommanz* are simplified by being translated once only in the *Romaunt* at ll. 2295-96, 2315-16, 3647-48. The following passages, on the other hand, appear repeated in the translation: *Rommanz*, ll. 1765-66, 1900-03 (repeated three times, although nearly the same idea had been repeated three times already in the lines just preceding both in the original and in the translation), 2177 and 2178 (repeated twice, although the same idea had already been repeated four or five times in the lines just preceding both in the original and in the translation), 3068-69, 3632-33, 4315-16, 4317-18, 4605-06, 11573-74. The last example is the only one found in Fragment C. There are none at all in Fragment A; but in B there are 14 instances. Eleven of them are repetitions of two lines introduced by the translator, and 3 are cases of suppression by the translator of repetitions which existed in the original.

A translated accurately on the average 8.58 lines out of every 10 of his original; B, 6.53 lines; and C, 7.47 lines. This matter which is literally translated appears in the translation as 8.28 lines in A, 6.25 lines in B, and 7.11 lines in C. There is no noticeable difference in the different parts in the relative expansion of this matter which is really translated literally. Interpolations, substitutions, and inaccurately translated matter to the amount of 2 lines to each 10 of the original in A, 5.53 lines in B, and 3.08 lines in C, make up the remainder of what we find in the text of the *Romaunt*. C has almost the same total expansion as A, when compared with the original, but arrives at the same result in a different way: about 1 line less in each 10 of the original is accurately translated, and the difference is offset by more matter being slightly altered or added by the translator.

The foregoing results may be briefly summarized as follows: All three fragments agree in showing no divergence in their way of translating the double negatives, and in retaining the *-esse*, *-able*, and *-té* rimes of the original with about the same frequency.

A differs from B and C: in always translating *diex* literally by "god," while the others show a tendency to pass over or avoid it; in retaining more of the *-age*, *-ie*, *-on* rimes of the original; and in making less use of interlinear substitutions.

B differs from C in showing more delicacy in avoiding a literal translation of *cul* meaning a part of the body. B differs from A in confusing the words of the groups *diex*, *amors*, *diex d'amors*, and *boutons*, *rose*, *rosiers*, by sometimes substituting in translation one term for another of the same group. B differs from both the other fragments: in changing the gender of the characters "Jalousie" and "Paor" from what it was in the original (the other fragments contain no reference to the gender of these two, but do not change the gender of any characters of which they do indicate the gender); in frequently inserting a pair of alternate lines as interlinear padding; in making numerous deviations from the original in the matter of lengthy repetitions; in avoiding the retention of *-ure* rimes occurring in the original; in retaining more of the *-ance*, *-ence* rimes than the others, as well

as showing a decided preference over A for retaining the *-isc* rimes. This tendency of B to retain more of some classes of rimes than the other translators is remarkable as indicating a decided habit of his; for Kaluza's statistics show that B in general had less of a tendency to retain the riming words of his original than the other translators had (A retaining 17.7 per cent.; B, 12 per cent.; C, 20.4 per cent.).

C differs from A and B: in avoiding, where possible, a literal translation of exact numbers, whereas the other fragments usually have them properly translated, even where it would have been easy to avoid them; in retaining more of the *-eus(e)*, *-ure* rimes of the original; in avoiding reproducing *-ie* rimes; in not resorting so often to interlinear padding; and in making more use of interlinear substitutions.

In addition to these differences in the three parts of the translation A, B, and C, there are also some differences between the first half of Fragment B and the last half.

The change in the gender of two of the characters from what it was in the original is more properly a difference between the last half of B and all the rest of the translation, as these changes occur only in the last part of B.

The first half of Fragment B differs from the second half of the same fragment in retaining a much smaller proportion of some of the "cheap rimes." Of the *-té*, *-tié* rimes, the first half of B shows 7 instances retained out of 24, while the second half has 10 retained out of 16. Of the *-ance*, *-ence* rimes the first half shows 9 out of 16 retained; the second half, 14 out of 17. Of the *-on* rimes, 5 out of 16 were kept in the first half; 13 out of 19, in the second half. Of the *-ie* rimes, the first half of B has 5 out of 13 retained; the second half, 13 out of 14.

There are 52 instances of interlinear padding in the first half of Fragment B to 39 instances in the last half.

There are twice as many instances in the first half of B, as compared with the last half, of variations from the original in the matter of lengthy repetitions.

The amount of matter literally translated from the original is about the same throughout Fragment B, but in the last half of

the fragment there is much wider fluctuation in the amount of matter slightly altered or interpolated than there is in the first half.

Are we to conclude that the portion heretofore known as Fragment B really consists of two parts? Hardly. Though there are some differences between the two halves of it, there is still more similarity. At any rate, the differences are of a rather microscopic character. There is no break or joint between the two parts, either, so far as observed. Only a general difference between the first part and the last part has been noticed, with no exact place of transition from the one to the other part apparent. In arranging the data contained in the foregoing, B has been divided into exact halves whenever there was a question of difference in the two parts of it. Furthermore, such a division of the poem into four fragments, containing each approximately a quarter of it, would raise the question as to whether the different parts are by different authors or not. In case they are, we should have to account for a remarkable state of affairs: the *Rommanz de la Rose* being translated in English by at least four different persons, and all of the translations being lost except a part of each, which some copyists put together in a sort of medley.

Though the evidence is not sufficient to permit us to conclude that Fragment B really consists of two parts, something may be inferred from it—the hint to be a little skeptical as to there being even three fragments. If Fragment B had the characteristics of Fragment C, and *vice versa*, and if the gap of over five thousand lines did not exist between B and C, then the poem would have a more continuous character: very good in the first quarter; not quite so good in the second quarter; and worse yet in the last half. In that case, investigators would probably not have been so eager to base a division of the translation into three fragments upon mere internal evidence, such as these indications of differences in Fragment B. The most noteworthy indication of a division into fragments (aside from the “Knop—Botoun” and “Bialacoil—Fair-welcoming” points, and the special title that C bears in the manuscript) is not so much the bare fact that the different parts differ in some internal characteristics, as the order in which the different parts, with their corresponding character-

istics, occur, and the big gap of over five thousand lines between two of them. Two of the fragments are almost alike. If they occurred in conjunction as a continuous translation, it might never have occurred to anyone to consider them separate fragments. But between them the continuity of the character of the composition is broken by a big gap of over five thousand lines, as well as by 4,105 lines of loosely translated matter (Fragment B) differing considerably from the beginning and end of the poem in rimes, in metrical and dialectal details, and in its names for two of the allegorical characters. The conclusion is thus hardly to be avoided that there are really three parts of the translation, though not necessarily by different authors.

Many of the details which have been published, showing differences in the different parts of the poem, are not of such a character as to prove anything, each taken separately. But they are worth something as a further confirmation of a division inferred from evidence of more capital importance. In this they are like the differences pointed out between the first half and the last half of Fragment B, except that the "evidence of more capital importance" for any such division of Fragment B is wanting.

The differences between the three fragments which are here published for the first time need not be considered as offering any evidence conclusive in itself, but they are worth something as a confirmation of the division into three fragments already made and commonly accepted. Doubtless some such differences in details could be found in the different parts of any literary composition of some length. But it is worthy of remark that, with a single exception, *all* the tests here applied resulted in finding some variations in the habits of translation, corresponding to this division into fragments.

The question of how many different authors produced the extant *Romaunt*, and what connection Chaucer had with the work, are matters more difficult to decide. We have plenty of data on the question. We have, indeed, more facts than we know what to do with. The facts are unfortunately not self-interpreting. Contradictory results are attained by different investigators by interpreting the facts in different ways. Louns-

bury concludes that Chaucer wrote the entire *Romaunt* as we have it; Kaluza claims for him only Fragments A and C; Skeat will not admit the Chaucerian authorship of any but Fragment A, and Koch denies that Chaucer wrote any part of the extant *Romaunt*. Their treatment of the matter was necessarily arbitrary, and in some cases unnecessarily inconsistent.

Anyone who proposes to make such a comparison must decide at the outset how rigorously he is going to apply his tests; how much latitude he is going to assume that Chaucer may have allowed himself in translating the *Rommanz* in regard to departures from the usage of his other undisputed works. And when this is done the question is practically decided in advance. Lounsbury assumes that Chaucer might take many liberties with his otherwise well-known usage, because he was making a literal translation in verse, and his desire to make a good translation caused him to be negligent in some small matters of rime, metre, and dialect, about which he would otherwise have been more careful. Lounsbury is therefore very indulgent toward the faults of the *Romaunt*, and eagerly accepts nearly everything in it as Chaucerian. Kaluza is also willing to grant Chaucer some liberties; he is glad of the chance to excuse in this way the departures from Chaucer's usage in rimes, metre, and dialect, as far as Fragments A and C are concerned, but somehow it does not occur to him to excuse the more numerous faults of the same nature in Fragment B in the same way. Skeat similarly is indulgently disposed toward the few departures from Chaucer's usage which we find in Fragment A, but he thinks Chaucer could never have allowed himself to make so many such blunders as we find in Fragment B, or even in Fragment C. Koch sees no need of assuming that Chaucer deviated from his customary practices at all when making a literal translation in verse, and he accordingly insists on a rigorous application of the rime test: if the *Romaunt* contains non-Chaucerian rimes (and it does in all three fragments, though very few in A), then it is decidedly not Chaucer's. Luick¹ is even so zealous in insisting on the purity and rigidity of Chaucer's usage that he claims that the single Northern rime "love : behove" in

¹ *Untersuchungen zur englischen Lautgeschichte*, pp. 268 f.

ll. 1091 and 1092 is enough to make Chaucer's authorship of Fragment A doubtful. This is going pretty far, but it has the merit of being consistent, at any rate.

We may ask ourselves what means these investigators have of knowing how much or how little Chaucer may have deviated from his usual habits in making this translation. That is a matter which no one can decide to the general satisfaction of others. Koch and Lounsbury, though arbitrary in their decision as to whether Chaucer's usage might vary or not, are at least consistent in their application of the tests.

Those who, like Skeat and Kaluza, attempt to "save part of the *Romaunt* for Chaucer," while denying his authorship for the rest of it, are more inconsistent. They both assume that Chaucer deviated from his usual habits in translating the *Romaunt*, but as to the extent of such deviations they cannot agree even with each other. Furthermore, they eagerly seize on every scrap of evidence of a difference between the bad part of the *Romaunt* and Chaucer's undisputed writings to prove non-Chaucerian authorship; but the points in which the bad parts of the *Romaunt* agree with Chaucer's writings are cheerfully dismissed with the explanation that they are the work of an imitator of Chaucer.

Nevertheless, the more consistent argumentation of Lounsbury and Koch has found but little support among others interested in the question. This is perhaps due to a disinclination to accept extreme views. The views of Skeat and Kaluza, who take middle ground between the Lounsbury extreme and the Koch extreme, have, however, met with almost general approval. Skeat's decision as to how much Chaucer's usage might vary when making a metrical translation seems to coincide with what most persons who are interested in the matter would consider likely, and so they agree with him (or, if they would allow Chaucer more latitude, they agree with Kaluza).

But such a way of deciding the matter is too subjective. It may be that the result obtained by such reasoning is the correct one. Skeat's or Kaluza's hypothesis, in spite of the inconsistencies, may represent the facts. Still, nothing has been positively proved. The question is yet an open one, in spite of the

pretensions of those who claim to have finally disposed of it. Perhaps no entirely satisfactory solution of the difficulty will ever be reached, unless another manuscript of the *Romaunt* should be found with some indication of the author's identity.

A. D. SCHOCH.

ITHACA, N. Y.

THE LOST LEAF OF "PIERS THE PLOWMAN"

Summer before last, in the enforced leisure of a long convalescence, I reread *Piers the Plowman*, or perhaps I had better say, read it for the first time; for, although I had more than once read the first seven passus of the B-Text and various other parts of the poem, I had never before read the whole of all three texts in such a way as to get any real sense of the relations of the versions to one another. Fortunately, I did not at that time possess a copy of Professor Skeat's two-volume edition, and consequently was obliged to use the edition which he published for the Early English Text Society. Thus I read each version separately and obtained a definite sense of its style and characteristics. Before the reading was completed, I found myself obliged to question very seriously the current view in regard to the relations of the three versions. The problems became so interesting that I devoted myself to a serious and careful study of them, with the aid of all the available apparatus, and have made them the subject of two courses with my students, who have given me useful suggestions and much help.

Every sort of investigation to which the versions have been subjected has resulted in confirming my original suspicions, and, indeed, in changing them from suspicions into certainties. I am now prepared, I think, to prove that the three versions are not the work of one and the same man, but each is the work of a separate and distinct author; that of the A-Text only the first eight passus are the work of the first author, the principal part of the vision of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest having been added by another author; and that not only lines 101-112 of Passus XII in MS Rawl. Poet. 137 are the work of Johan But, but that he is responsible for a considerable portion of that passus, probably for at least one-half of it. These conclusions, if accepted, of course entirely destroy the personality built up for the author, mainly from details given only in the C-Text, on the theory that all parts of all three versions are by the same hand; and, indeed, make it doubtful, as I

shall try to show, whether the autobiographical details were intended, even by the author of C, to be taken as genuine traits of the author himself instead of attributes of the dreamer—that is to say, whether the dreamer is not as much a fictional character as any of the other figures which participate in the dream. I shall try to support these conclusions by differences in language, differences in versification, differences in the use and in the kind of figurative language, and above all by such striking differences in the mental powers and qualities of the authors as make it highly improbable that they can be one and the same person; and I shall point out such misunderstandings on the part of each of the later authors of passages expanded by him as seem to me to change the probabilities derived from the other kinds of evidence into certainties. It will appear further, I think, that the merits of the A-Text have been seriously underestimated, and that it is in reality not merely artistically the best of the three, but is in unity of structure, vividness of conception, and skill of versification, on a level with the best work of the fourteenth century, including Chaucer's.

The materials supporting these conclusions are now well in hand, but I shall not be able to put them into form for publication until the advent of my vacation, which will occur in the coming spring. I feel confident that I can then fill out this outline and justify the promises herein made. I make this announcement now in order that other scholars may investigate the problems and be ready to pass a critical judgment upon my results when they appear. I am aware that this will prevent the book from creating any sensation when it appears, but it is of less consequence that the book should make a sensation than that the problems should be subjected to a long and critical investigation by more than one person. Meanwhile, I offer for consideration the investigation of a small problem which easily detaches itself from the general argument, although, as will be seen, it contributes something to it.

In the A-Text, the whole of Passus V is devoted to the effects of the preaching of Conscience upon the "field full of folk." Repentance comes to them, and they confess their sins and

promise amendment. The chief penitents are the personifications of the Seven Deadly Sins. The last of these personifications is Sloth. The passage concerning him begins with l. 222, and it is this passage, with the lines immediately following, to which I invite your attention.

- ¶ Sleuþe for serwe · fel doun I-swowene
 Til *vigilate* þe veil · fette water at his eizen,
 And flatte on his face · and faste on him criþede, 224
 And seide, "war þe for wonhope · þat Wol þe bi-traye.
 ¶ 'Icham sori for my sunnes' · sei to þi-seluen,
 And bet þi-self on þe Breste · and bidde god of grace,
 For nis no gult her so gret · his Merci nis wel more."
 ¶ Penne sat sleuþe vp · and sikede sore, 229
 And made a-vou bi-fore god · for his foule sleuþe;
 "Schal no soneday þis seuen ȝer · (bote seknesse hit make),
 Þat I ne schal do me ar day · to þe deore churchē,
 And here Matins and Masse · as I a Monk were. 232
 ¶ Schal non ale after mete · holde me pennes,
 Til ichaue Euensong herd · I beo-hote to þe Rode.
 And ȝit I-chulle ȝelden aȝeyn · ȝif I so muche haue,
 Al þat I wikkedliche won · seþþe I wit hade. 237
 ¶ And þauh my lyflode lakke · letten I nulle
 Þat vche mon schal habben his · er ich henne wende:
 And with þe Residue and þe remenaunt · (bi þe Rode of Chester!)
 I schal seche seynt Treuþe · er I seo Rome!" 241
 ¶ Robert þe Robbour · on *Reddite* he lokede,
 And for þer nas not Wher-with · he wepte ful sore.
 And ȝit þe sunfol schrewe · seide to him-seluen: 244
 "Crist, þat vppon Caluarie · on þe Cros dizedest,
 Do Dismas my broþer · bi-souȝte þe of grace,
 And heddest Merci of þat mon · for *Memento* sake,
 Þi wille worþ vppon me · as Ich haue wel deseruet
 To haue helle for euere · ȝif þat hope neore. 249
 So rewe on me, Robert · þat no Red haue,
 Ne neuere weene to wyne · for Craft þat I knowe.
 Bote for þi muchel Merci · mitigacion I be-seche; 252
 Dampne me not on domes day · for I dude so ille."
 ¶ Ak what fel of þis Feloun · I con not feire schewe,
 But wel Ich wot he wepte faste · watur with his eizen,
 And knouhlechede his gult · to Crist ȝit eft-sones, 256
 Þat *Penitencia* his pike he schulde polissche newe,
 And lepe with him ouerlond · al his lyf tyme,
 For he haþ leizen bi *latro* · lucifers brother.

It will be observed at once, that while ll. 222-35 are thoroughly appropriate to Sloth, ll. 236-41 are entirely out of harmony with his character, and could never have been assigned to him by so careful an artist as A, who in no single instance assigns to any character either words or actions not clearly and strictly appropriate. Careful consideration of the passage and comparison of it and ll. 242-59 with ll. 222-35, will convince everyone, I believe, that ll. 236-41 really belong to Robert the Robber, and are a part either of his confession, or of a confession suggested to him by someone else (cf. ll. 226-28). Robert the Robber, it will be seen, decides to make restitution of his ill-gotten wealth, or is urged to make such a decision, but, on looking for the goods with which to make repayment, is unable to find any, and is obliged to cast himself wholly and entirely upon the mercy of God. Is it not clear, then, that there is really a lacuna between l. 235 and l. 236; and evidently not a gap of one or two lines, such as might occur in consequence of the eye of the scribe catching up the wrong word and skipping a few lines? The query naturally suggested is: "May not a whole leaf of the MS have been lost?" This would make a gap of many lines, sufficient for the development of the confession of Robert the Robber upon some such scale as those of Envy, ll. 59-106, Covetousness, ll. 107-45, Gluttony, ll. 146-221; for a transition, if any be necessary, from these personified abstractions to the concrete figure of the Robber; and also for a less abrupt ending of the confession of Sloth. Many of the MSS measure $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6$ inches, or thereabouts (see Skeat's descriptions in the prefaces to the EETS ed.); MS L has c. 40 lines to a page, R has c. 31, W measures $11\frac{1}{2} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$ inches, but is "in a large hand," Y has c. 37, O has c. 40, C₂ has c. 37, I has c. 31, F has c. 37, S ranges from 33 to 44, K has c. 34, Douce 104 has 34 or 35, Hl. 2376 has c. 37, Roy. B. xvii has c. 38; of the MSS of the A-Text, U has c. 33 (or, according to another statement, c. 28), D has c. 31, Trin. Dub. 4. 12 has c. 30. Of course there were also MSS much larger than these,¹ but it seems not improbable that the page of the original may have

¹ MS V has a very large page, containing two columns of 80 lines each; the Lincoln's Inn MS, written about 1450, has 52, 53 lines to a page; MS T runs from 42 to 46; H and Hl. 3954 have 40 each.

contained between 30 and 40, and consequently that the lost leaf may have contained between 60 and 80 lines.

But if the leaf was lost, it must have been missing in the original of all the extant MSS of the A-Text, for all of them contain the passage under discussion in precisely the same form, except for insignificant variations in spelling, etc. It is easy enough to understand how the copyists were undisturbed by the sense (or nonsense) of the passage, but it is not easy to see how the torn remnant of this half-sheet could have entirely escaped attention, if there were any such remnant; and if there was none, the other half of the sheet also would pretty certainly have disappeared very soon. This is precisely what I think occurred.

It has long been pointed out as a curious feature of the vision of the Seven Deadly Sins in this passus that the sin of Wrath is entirely overlooked and omitted. It is incredible that any mediæval author writing specifically on such a topic and dealing with it at such length¹ could have forgotten or overlooked any of these well-known categories; and it is especially impossible to ascribe such an omission to an author whose work shows the firmness and mastery of structure exhibited in A. Let us, then, inquire whether the same accident that caused the confusion in regard to the confession of Sloth may not have caused the total loss of the confession of Wrath.

Comparison of the order of the Sins in A II, 60 ff. (and the corresponding passages in B and C) with A V, 45-235, B V, 63 ff.; C VII, 14 ff. will indicate that the proper place for Wrath in this passage is immediately after Envy. This is indeed the usual order, and Chaucer, following Peraldus,² says: "After Envye wol I discryven the sinne of Ire. For soothly, whoso hath envye

¹ Wrath is also omitted in the *feoffment* in A II, 60-74, where the intention is clearly to give to False and Meed all the territories of the Seven Deadly Sins; but the loss involved is one of one line only, which may easily have been omitted in the original of all the extant MSS. In Skeat's text, l. 64, Lechery is also omitted; but the readings of four of the MSS show that MS V has merely omitted the words "of lecherie"—the only other MS recorded in the textual note has the correct reading, but it is inserted in a later hand, this line as well as the preceding having been inadvertently omitted. It may be remarked that the author of the B-Text failed to observe the simple and systematic nature of this *feoffment* (perhaps because of the omission of Wrath), and consequently, in expanding it, entirely obliterated the original intention. This is only one of many instances to be cited in favor of my main thesis.

² K. O. Petersen, *The Sources of the Parson's Tale*, p. 49.

upon his neighbor, anon he wole comunly finde him a matere of wratthe."¹ The place for Wrath in Passus V is therefore between l. 106 and l. 107. Between this point and ll. 235, 236, where the confusion in regard to Sloth occurs, there are 129 lines. Now it is clear that, if the two leaves of a sheet are gone, as we suppose, the gaps will be separated by four pages, or a multiple of four.² In the present instance the distance between the gaps makes about four pages of the size discussed above, and the lost double leaf was, therefore, the next to the innermost of a section or gathering. We might leave the matter here, but a little further inquiry will determine the precise number of lines to the page in the MS, and incidentally confirm our reasoning. The number of lines between the gaps is in Skeat's edition 129, as I have said; but l. 182 is in H only, and as Skeats suspects, is spurious, "being partly imitated from l. 177;" furthermore, ll. 202-7 are found in U only, and the first word of l. 208 shows that they are spurious, and that l. 208 should immediately follow l. 201. Seven lines must therefore be deducted from 129 to ascertain the number lying between the two gaps in the original. This will give us 122 lines, or two less than four pages of 31 each. As the number of lines to a page is never absolutely constant (Skeat finds it necessary to attach a *circa* to every statement of this kind), this would seem entirely satisfactory; but if space of one line was left between Covetousness and Gluttony, and between Gluttony and Sloth, the whole 124 would be exactly accounted for.³

Confirmation of this argument may perhaps be found in a circumstance pointed out to me by Mr. T. A. Knott, one of my students. He calls attention to the abruptness of the close of the confession of Envy, which has, of course, been noted by everyone; he thinks it not only abrupt, but unsatisfactory, and suggests that the leaf lost at this point contained, not only the whole of the confession of Wrath, but also a few concluding lines belonging to Envy.

¹ P. T., § 32, v. 533.

² Of course the two gaps would make only one if the lost double leaf were the middle one of a section or gathering.

³ Clearly there were no headings, as in some MSS of B and C, for none of the MSS descended from A have them, but there may have been an interval of a line between the confessions. This supposition is, however, of little moment to the argument.

Still further confirmation, slight though it be, may be found, it occurs to me, in the fact that, while not only every new section, but every new paragraph, in some of the MSS collated by Professor Skeat, is indicated by a paragraph mark, none stands at the beginning of l. 236. And whatever may be thought of my contention that ll. 236-41 do not belong to Sloth, it is at least certain that they constitute a new paragraph. If they belong to Sloth, the mark was omitted by error; if to Robert the Robber, no mark stands there because the paragraph does not begin there but earlier, as the conjunction "And" indeed indicates.

We have found, then, that the hypothesis of a lost leaf between l. 235 and l. 236 not only explains all the difficulties of the text at that point—such as the inappropriateness of ll. 236-41 to Sloth, their true relation to ll. 242-59, the abrupt ending of the confession of Sloth and the absence of a paragraph mark at l. 236—but also accounts for the unaccountable omission of the confession of Wrath and for the abruptness of the end of the confession of Envy.

The omission of Wrath and the confusion as to Sloth were noticed by B, and he treated them rather ingeniously. He introduced into the earlier part of Sloth's confession a declaration that he had often been so slothful as to withhold the wages of his servants and to forget to return things he had borrowed. To supply the omission of Wrath, he himself wrote a *Confessio Irae*, totally different in style from the work of A, and, indeed, more appropriate for Envy than for Wrath, containing as it does no very distinctive traits of Wrath. The additions both here and in the confession of Sloth are confused, vague, and entirely lacking in the finer qualities of imagination, organization, and diction shown in all A's work. He did not attempt to deal with the other difficulties we have found.

It is possible, I suppose, to accept my argument up to the beginning of the preceding paragraph, and still maintain that B was after all the author of A also and merely rectified in his second version errors that had crept into his first. To do this, however, one must resolutely shut one's eyes to the manifest and manifold differences in mental qualities, in constructive ability, in

vividness of diction, in versification, and in many other matters, that exist between A I-VIII and B. These will form a part of the volume in which I hope to define the portions of this great poem to be allotted to each of the principal writers engaged upon it, to set forth clearly their differences, and to vindicate for the first author the rank he clearly deserves. The work will not be, I think, entirely one of destructive criticism. The poem, as a whole, will gain in interest and significance; and the intellectual life of the second half of the fourteenth century will seem even more vigorous than it has seemed.

JOHN MATTHEWS MANLY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

CHAUCER AND DANTE

Dante is well known to have directly influenced some scores of lines of Chaucer's poetry, but several other passages, not without interest, seem to have been generally overlooked. In one of them Chaucer may almost as justly be charged with bringing the heavenly Venus down into the service of the earthly as in Troilus' hymn to Love (III, 1261-67), for which he pillages St. Bernard's hymn to Mary at the end of the "Paradiso." The former passage also is to be found in the "Troilus and Criseyde," where the heroine is reproaching herself for having left Troy and Troilus (V, 743-49):

To late is now to speke of this matere;
Prudence, allas! oon of thyn eyen three
Me lakked alwey, er that I cam here;
On tyme y-passed wel remembred me;
And present tyme eek coude I wel y-see.
But futur tyme, er I was in the snare,
Coude I not seen; that causeth now my care.

In the mystic Triumph of the Church, at the end of the "Purgatorio," on the left of the chariot dance the four cardinal virtues, led by Prudence (XXIX, 130-32):

Dalla sinistra quattro facean festa,
In porpora vestite, dietro al modo
D'una di lor, ch' avea tre occhi in testa.

This symbolism is accounted for by a passage in the Convito.¹ Dante follows the pseudo-Seneca² in making Prudence relate to past, present, and future, but he alone, so far as has been found,

¹"Conviensi adunque essere *Prudente*, cioè *Savio*: e a ciò essere si richiede buona memoria delle vedute cose, e buona conoscenza delle presenti, e buona provvidenza delle future."—"Convito," IV, 27, 42-46 (E. Moore, *Tutte le opere di Dante*, Oxford, 1894).

²Two passages are quoted and attributed to Seneca by Dante's son to illustrate the "Purgatorio" passage; see *Petri Allegherii super Dantis ipsius genitoris comediam commentarium*, edited by Lord Vernon (Florence, 1845), p. 507; or see the notes on the passage by Scartazzini or Niccolò Tommaseo. The second of these quotations I have been unable to trace, but the first will be found in the *De formula honestae vitae, vel de quatuor virtutibus cardinalibus*, successively and erroneously attributed to Seneca (in the Middle Ages) and to Martin of Braga (Martinus Dumiensis), and usually published with their works; see the editions of Seneca by Friedrich Haase (Teubner, 1872), Vol. III, p. 470, and by M. N. Bouillet (Paris, 1829), Vol. IV, p. 450. On the authorship, see *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la* 367]

gives her three eyes. Whether Chaucer is indebted to the "Convito" or to Dante's source,¹ or is giving an independent interpretation of Dante's sufficiently obvious symbolism, does not appear, but he certainly alludes to the passage in the "Purgatorio."

In the *balade* in both versions of the prologue to the "Legend of Good Women" (A, 206, 207; B, 252, 253), "Marcia Catoun" appears among exemplary wives:

Penalopee, and Marcia Catoun,
Mak of your wyfhod no comparisoun.

Mr. Lounsbury and Mr. Skeat believe² the reference to be derived from St. Jerome's mention, in his work against Jovinian, of "Marcia Catonis filia minor" among good wives in ancient history;³ a supposition the more natural since they believe the so-called version A of the prologue, later in which (281-304) this work of St. Jerome's is expressly named and described (as it is not in B), to be the earlier version. I wish to point out the probability that Chaucer did not derive his information from this work. The question is somewhat connected with that as to the priority of version A or B of the prologue. If A is the earlier, St. Jerome seems less unlikely to be the source than if B is the earlier; on the other hand, if the reference in the *balade* has a different source, all Chaucer's use of this work, so far as we

Bibliothèque nationale (Paris, 1890), Vol. XXXIII, Part 1, pp. 213-16, and cf. Part 2, p. 174; these references I owe to the kindness of Dr. G. L. Hamilton. The passage is quoted in a slightly wrong form by Albertano of Brescia, *Liber consolationis et consilii* (ed. by T. Sundby for the Chaucer Society, 1873), pp. 57, 58: "Si prudens es, animus tuus tribus temporibus dispensetur: praesentia ordina, futura provide, praeterita recordare," etc. It does not occur in the "Tale of Melibeus" (ultimately, of course, derived from this), which is greatly condensed where it would have come (B, 2390-2405). It is therefore probably not in Chaucer's French original (inaccessible to me), which is merely an adaptation of the Latin of Albertano. But the *De formula* and other works by the pseudo-Seneca are frequently quoted in Melibeus.

¹ Chaucer was certainly not very familiar with the "Convito," but Dr. Emil Koeppl (*Anglia*, Vol. XIII, p. 185) makes out a pretty good case for his having read this same part of it when he wrote the "Wife of Bath's Tale;" cf. *WBT*, D 1109-18, and "Gentillesse," 15, with "Convito," IV, 3, 43-55. When Chaucer wrote "Melibeus," there is no evidence that he made any use of Albertano's Latin (Emil Koeppl in *Herrig's Archiv*, Vol. LXXXVI, pp. 29-30); but when he wrote the "Merchant's Tale" he certainly used it (*ibid.*, pp. 38, 39). The tales of the Wife of Bath and the Merchant, however, were probably written some fifteen years after the "Troilus."

² *Studies in Chaucer*, Vol. II, p. 294; *Oxford Chaucer*, Vol. III, p. 299. A little later in the chapter of St. Jerome's work from which they cite might be found a better ground for their opinion than the one they give.

³ "Adversus Jovinianum," I, 46 (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, Vol. XXIII, col. 275).

know, will fall into the period of the *Canterbury Tales*, which will slightly strengthen the argument for a late date for Prologue A. Since this question of priority has of late been vigorously reopened,¹ a discussion of the source of the reference seems timely.

A reading of the chapter in which St. Jerome refers to Marcia will show that there is far from being anything immediately convincing in Lounsbury's attribution. Her name occurs, it is true, among those of several of the heroines whom Chaucer mentions, and she is praised for lamenting her husband and refusing to marry again; but the reason she gave is that she could find no man who desired her more than her property. Several other "*Mulieres Romanae Insignes*" in this and the preceding chapters would have been, as Skeat himself admits in one case, much more suitable to figure in the *balade*—including Bilia, and especially Porcia, wife of Brutus. It is striking that in the only passage where Chaucer certainly uses this part of St. Jerome's work ("Franklin's Tale," F 1367-1456), from which he adduces a large number of virtuous women, including the two just mentioned, no Marcia appears. It is also noteworthy that St. Jerome immediately mentions the other Marcia, Cato's wife, with disapproval for her deficiencies in chastity and constancy. It might be supposed that Chaucer would avoid the possibility of such confusion, if he knew of the two; the curious addition which he makes of the father's and husband's name could hardly distinguish the daughter from the wife.²

¹ See John L. Lowes, *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. XIX, pp. 593-683; and a recent Johns Hopkins dissertation, *The Problem of the Two Prologues to Chaucer's Legend of Good Women*, by John C. French (Baltimore: J. H. Furst Co., 1905).

² It is natural to inquire why Chaucer attaches Cato's name to Marcia's. Did he regard it as a patronymic or as an ordinary surname? After considerable search in Middle English and Old French I can find no parallel to "Marcia Catoun" as meaning "Marcia daughter of Cato," except that four times in "*Melibeus*" Chaucer mentions "*Iesus Syrak*:" in each case the words are the same in Albertano's Latin, as against "*Iesus filius Syrak*" in the more original "*Merchant's Tale*," E 2250, and "*Jesu filii Sirach*" twice in the *Vulgate*. That some of the scribes did not understand Chaucer's phrase as a patronymic is clear, for several of the manuscripts read "Penelope, Marcia and Catoun." Chaucer probably used the last word like a modern surname to distinguish this Marcia, not from her daughter, but from the other Marcia whom he mentions ("*House of Fame*," 1229-32), "Marcia that lost her skin," the satyr Marsyas, of course, whose name he had misunderstood (Dante, "*Paradiso*," I, 20). He was also, doubtless, not sorry to have another rhyme-word in *-oun*, in a poem where he required nine such rhymes. Lucan, "*Pharsalia*," II, 328-49 (Paris, 1830), tells the story of the elder Marcia, in terms which would hardly have recommended her for Chaucer's purpose, and speaks of her desire for the epitaph CATONIS MARCIA. But there

In the *Divine Comedy*, with which we know that Chaucer was perfectly familiar when he wrote the *Legend of Good Women*, Dante represents himself as meeting Marcia, the wife of Cato, in Limbo;¹ nothing is said, of course, as to the eccentric passages in her married life of which the saint speaks, but she has an honorable place among heroes and heroines of antiquity, virgins and chaste matrons, of whom two others, Lucretia and Lavinia, appear in Chaucer's *balade*. On the shores of Purgatory Virgil appeals to Cato in the name of his chaste and constant wife:

Ma son del cerchio ove son gli occhi casti
Di Marcia tua, che in vista ancor ti prega,
O santo petto, che per tua la tegni:
Per lo suo amore adunque a noi ti piega;—²

an appeal which Cato rejects only because earthly love can no longer affect him. Is not this a more probable source of Chaucer's reference than the other?

It even seems possible to point out a matter where Dante made some contribution to Chaucer's intellectual life. The only philosophical subject in which Chaucer shows any constant interest is the question as to the relation between fate and chance, divine foreordination and foreknowledge and human free-will; this subject he speaks of now indirectly, now lightly, now seriously, but he constantly speaks of it.³ He seems never to have quite made up his mind on the subject, but (especially early in his literary life) to have had a leaning to a kind of determinism. His attitude in the matter is thoroughly characteristic in its strong feeling, and

is little evidence that Chaucer knew that work. Skeat is certainly right in rejecting Bell's explanation of Chaucer's praise as due to her "complaisance" in being lent to Hortensius. "Marcia Catoun" is twice mentioned, along with Alcestis, by Lydgate, who is simply following Chaucer (*Oxford Chaucer*, Vol. VII, pp. 272, 289). Marcia the younger and her first remark appear in Deschamps' "Miroir de Mariage," 5434-48 (Paris, 1894; Vol. IX, p. 178), which follows St. Jerome, but they are used simply to show how mercenary people are.

¹ "Inferno," IV, 128.

² "Purgatorio," I, 78-81. Dante, quoting Lucan, allegorizes and tells more of her story in the Convito, IV, 23, 97-163.

³ For two long discussions, see "Troilus and Criseyde," IV, 958-1078 (largely from Boethius; greatly out of place where it occurs, and therefore indicative of Chaucer's personal interest), and "Nun's Priest's Tale," B 4424-40. Cf. also "Complaint of Mars," 218-26; "T. and C.," II, 621-23; V, 1550, 1551 (besides one or two passages derived from Boccaccio); "Legend of Good Women," 952, 2580-82; "Knight's Tale," 1066-91 (modified by astrology), 1108, 1109, 1303-6 (none of them in Boccaccio; 2987 ff. is); "Man of Law's Tale," 190-96, 295-315 (both astrological); "Nun's Priest's Tale," 4407, 4528; and see below.

yet its skepticism; Gower, for example, at times makes remarks somewhat like Chaucer's, but is, as usual, perfunctory, contradictory, and vague. The chief literary source of Chaucer's views is the latter part of Boethius' *De consolacione philosophiae*, but it is clear that he read with deep interest what Dante has to say on the question why things happen. The striking passage in the "Inferno" in which Dante makes Fortune a sort of semi-divine intermediary between God and mundane affairs, and from which I quote the most significant lines, has directly and unmistakably influenced three or four places in Chaucer's poetry.

Questa Fortuna , che è . . . ?
 Colui lo cui saper tutto trascende
 Similmente agli splendor mondani
 Ordinò general ministra e duce,
 Che permutasse a tempo li ben vani,
 Di gente in gente e d'uno in altro sangue,
 Oltre la difension de' senni umani:
 Perchè una gente impera, e l'altra langue. . . .
 Le sue permutazion non hanno triegue.¹

Fortune, whiche that permutacioun
 Of thinges hath, as it is hir committed
 Through purveyaunce and disposicioun
 Of heighe Jove, as regnes shal ben flitted
 Fro folk in folk.²

But O, Fortune, executrice of wierdes,
 O influences of thise hevenes hye!
 Soth is, that, under god, ye ben our hierdes.³
 The destinee, ministre general,

¹ "Inferno," VII, 68, 69, 73, 77-82, 88. Clearly under the influence of Boethius, IV, prose 6 (see Oxford Chaucer, Vol. II, pp. 115, 116, ll. 60-71). The influences of Boethius and Dante on Chaucer here are hard to disentangle.

² Troilus and Criseyde, V, 1541-45. Noted by W. M. Rossetti, *Parallel Text Edition of the Troilus and the Filostrato* (Chaucer Society), p. 289, but ignored by Cary, Skeat, and Lounsbury. The last-named scholar professes to give (*Studies in Chaucer*, Vol. II, pp. 240, 241) a complete list of borrowings from Dante in the "Troilus," but omits also III, 1261-67 (noted by Cary and Skeat); I will add that he seems greatly to underestimate Dante's influence on Chaucer. It may not be impertinent to call attention once more to the fact that Cary, in the notes to his translation of the *Divine Comedy*, pointed out a large number of borrowings by Chaucer, as well as by other poets. Another clear case which he notes (*The Vision* [London, 1831], Vol. I, p. 201) is ignored by Skeat and Lounsbury.

³ "His lustes were al lawe in his decrees" (of Nero, "Monk's Tale," B 3667);

"Che libito fe' licito in sua legge" (of Semiramis, "Inferno," V, 56).

On Chaucer and Dante cf. also Emil Koeppl, *Anglia*, Vol. XIII, pp. 184-86.

³ *Ibid.*, III, 617-19.

That executeth in the world over-al
 The purveyaunce that God hath seyn biforn,
 So strong it is, that, though the world had sworn
 The contrarie of a thing, by ye or nay,
 Yet somtyme it shal fallen on a day
 That falleth not eft with-inne a thousand yere.¹

As was his aventure, or his fortune,
 That us governeth alle as in commune.²

This interest of Chaucer's in fortune and the like appears also in a less important but more curious way. Such phrases as "by aventure" or "per cas" occur often enough anywhere, as well as in Chaucer's works, but such more deliberative expressions as the following are less obvious, and are decidedly characteristic of him and of his late style:

Were it by aventure, or sort, or cas,³
 And so bifel, by aventure or cas,⁴
 Were it by aventure or destinee,
 (As, whan a thing is shapen, it shal be)
 Were it by destinee or aventure,
 Were it by influence or by nature,
 Or constellacion,⁵

But thus they mette, of aventure or grace;⁶

With these again belongs the passage above from the "Nun's Priest's Tale," 4189, 4190. Anything similar I find only in Dante:

Ei cominciò: "Qual fortuna o destino
 Anzi l'ultimo dì quaggiù ti mena?"⁷
 Se voler fu, o destino, o fortuna,
 Non so: ma passeggiando tra le teste,
 Forte percossi il piè nel viso ad una.⁷

Different as the two poets were, such was the power of the one and the receptiveness of the other that the greater affected both the other's view of the universe and his style.

JOHN S. P. TATLOCK.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

¹ "Knight's Tale," A 1063-69. The last two lines are directly from "Teseide," V, 77, 1-2. The earlier part of the passage is somewhat similar to "Teseide," VI, 1, 1-4. But Chaucer's verses are more like Dante's, to which Boccaccio's are also indebted, and it may also be noted that the passage in the "Teseide" stands nearly 250 lines later than the part of that poem which Chaucer is here using.

² "Nun's Priest's Tale," B 4189, 4190.

³ "Prologue," 844.

⁴ "Knight's Tale," A 1074, 1465, 1466.

⁵ "Merchant's Tale," E 1967-69.

⁶ "Franklin's Tale," F 1508.

⁷ "Inferno," XV, 46, 47; XXXII, 76-78.

SPENSER'S "TWELVE PRIVATE MORALL VERTUES
AS ARISTOTLE HATH DEvised"

"Knowing how doubtfully all allegories may be construed" Spenser, "being so comanded" by Raleigh, wrote his famous letter, "expounding his whole intention in the course of [his] worke," the *Faerie Queene*. Raleigh had apparently had some difficulty in understanding the purport of this "darke conceit," to use Spenser's own words, and had desired explanations "for [his] better light in reading thereof." The letter was printed at the end of the volume published in 1590 which contained the first three books of the poem.

Spenser reveals in it the complicated mechanism of his work, as well as the high moral motive he had in writing it: "The generall end . . . of all the booke is to fashion a gentleman or noble person in vertuous and gentle discipline." In this view, he had chosen for his hero, and for the pattern of such gentlemen or noble persons, King Arthur. Deriving his inspiration from the more or less real precedents offered by Homer, Virgil, Ariosto, and Tasso, he labored "to pourtraict in Arthure, before he was king, the image of a brave knight, perfected in the twelve private morall vertues as Aristotle hath devised."

Coming to this important passage, so positive and precise, every student expects a note. Did Aristotle really supply the groundwork of the *Faerie Queene*? Where is this list of "the twelve private morall vertues" to be found? From such a high authority as Spenser such a peremptory statement is of the sort which one scarcely dares to contest, and about which one is even less tempted to confess ignorance. Who does not know what the twelve private moral virtues are—those virtues, a list of which Aristotle has devised?

Critics seem to have felt like the humblest students; unwilling to contest or confess, they said little or nothing; so that in many minds the twelve virtues of Aristotle continue to hold their ground.

They should not. Spenser showed, as a rule, no minute accuracy in his indications of sources and models, and he did not display more than usual in this particular case. Three treatises on morals have come down to us under the name of Aristotle; one alone, the *Nicomachean Ethics*, being, as it seems, truly his; the others appear to be a make-up, drawn from his teachings by some disciples; they are incoherent and incomplete, and of little avail for our purpose.

In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, on the other hand, Aristotle devotes considerable space to a technical study of moral virtues, showing, or trying to show, that they consist in a mean or middle state between two faulty extremes. With the persistency of the theoretician, he forces each and every virtue within the same mold, though he has to confess sometimes that there is no name for a particular virtue, which is bound, however, to exist, as its two faulty extremes are known; at other times, that one or the other of these extremes has no name, and indeed scarcely any real existence.

What most strikes a reader of Spenser is that Aristotle draws nowhere any dogmatic list of virtues; he does not totalize their number; and such totalization would indeed be difficult, as, according to his own declarations, some of his virtues are only a branch or development of another virtue (as Liberality and Magnificence); some, admitted into the class at one part of the work, are described elsewhere as doubtfully belonging to it; others, finally, are treated of quite apart, at great length; but it is not clear whether, if one wanted to do what Aristotle neglected to perform—that is, to tabulate his moral virtues—these should, or should not, be admitted in the list. Such is the case with Justice, declared by Aristotle not to be, properly speaking, a separate virtue, but a combination and condensation of all the others; as without justice there would be no courage, no self-control, no mansuetude, etc. (Book V, chap. 2). Such is the case also with Friendship, whose admission into the treatise is justified, not to say excused, on the plea that it is either a virtue, or related to virtue, and that it is most necessary in life. If it had been considered a moral virtue proper, it would have come at its place,

with all the others, and there would have been no need for such justifications.

No wonder, given this, that commentators have not agreed, and that some have considered that Aristotle's virtues are nine, others ten or eleven, in number. As a matter of fact, in his Book II, chap. 7, and further when he studies separately each virtue, Book III, chaps. 9 ff., and Book IV, he mentions ten, one of which, however, has no name, and another (Magnificence) is only the same as the next, but practiced by the very rich, instead of by the moderately rich, man. These virtues are: Courage; Self-control or Temperance; Liberality; Magnificence (that is, the liberality of the very rich); Magnanimity; a nameless virtue midway between ambition and total indifference to ambition; Mansuetude; Truthfulness; Jocularitv; Friendliness¹ (which is not friendship). There is also a chapter on Shame (*aidōs*, Lat. *verecundia*), though "it is not correct to call it a virtue." But "neither is Self-control," adds Aristotle in the same chapter. So that, if we include both, we have a total of eleven; if we exclude both, a total of nine; if we admit Self-control alone, a total of ten. Adding arbitrarily Justice and Friendship, or only one of them—which we cannot do save by forgetting that Aristotle has treated them apart, and shown that *he* did not include them in his regular count—we should have a total varying from ten to thirteen; a total of twelve being perhaps the most arbitrary of all and the most difficult to reach.

The nature of the virtues considered by Spenser matches the Aristotelian selection scarcely better than their number. We know of only six, corresponding to the only six books he wrote, namely: Holiness, Temperance, Chastity, Friendship, Justice, Courtesy.²

¹ Aristotle calls it *φιλία* at one place, and at another declares that it has really no name of its own.

² We leave unnoticed the "two cantos of Mutabilitie which . . . appears to be parcell of some following Booke of the Faerie Queene under the Legend of Constance," first printed in 1609. The fact that they truly belong to the great poem is doubtful, and their being part of a book which would have dealt with Constancy is a mere guess of the printer—one which may very well be wide of the mark. In the fragment we possess the poet seems to oppose the general unstability of things, not at all to any "private morall vertue," but to the changeless happy state when, in God, "all shall rest eternally." Fairy Land is mentioned, but not one of the heroes of the great poem appears in this fragment.

Holiness is certainly not borrowed from Aristotle's series of moral virtues; Chastity may be held to have been, if we give the word the sense of "shame" (*verecundia*), and neglect the fact that Aristotle, while studying it, declares that this "shame" is *not* a virtue. The reader knows what the case is with Friendship and Justice. Courtesy may be held to correspond, if to anything, to Aristotle's *φιλία* ("friendliness"), but not without a considerable extension and modernization of the word. Identification is the more doubtful as such a contemporary of Spenser's as Piccolomini (see below, pp. 5 ff.) calls *urbanita* the virtue named by Aristotle Jocularity or Easy Pleasantry; and Piccolomini's translator, Pierre de Larivey (1581), translates *urbanita* o *piacevolezza* by *courtoisie ou gayeté*. Aristotle's description of friendliness best suits, however, without matching it exactly, the modern notion of courtesy.

Temperance remains, and is the only one of Spenser's six virtues truly and plainly corresponding to one of Aristotle's.

At this point we are, I think, entitled to conclude that Spenser's statement that he intends "to pourtraict in Arthur, before he was king, the image of a brave knight, perfected in the twelve private morall vertues as Aristotle hath devised," is misleading, every word of it. There is no such definite list; Aristotle's number is not twelve, and the virtues he studies are far from being the same as those forming the subject of the *Fuerie Queene*.

But why, then, this choice by Spenser, and why this number twelve? It must be remembered that, at the time of the Renaissance (and the Renaissance, progressing slowly northward, reached its full *épanouissement* in England only under Elizabeth), the problem of the rearing of the ideal gentleman and perfect citizen was one of those most ardently studied. The ancients, whose cult had now so many adherents, had left important treatises on similar questions; these works were passionately discussed and interpreted; they were translated and adapted; many tried to turn the principles in them into use again, modifying them just enough to fit the necessities of modern life. For this cause Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, Plato's *Republic*, and Cicero's *De Officiis* enjoyed an immense popularity.

Spenser has informed us, in his letter to Raleigh, that "the generall end of all [his] booke [was] to fashion a gentleman or noble person in vertuous and gentle discipline." That is to say, he assigned to himself the very task above mentioned, and which had been attempted before him by numerous writers in Italy, in France, and even in England. In the latter country, to mention only the most striking example, Sir Thomas Elyot had published in 1531 his *Boke named the Governour*, in which he sketches "the education or fourme of bryngynge up the chylde of a gentilman which is to have auctorite in the publike weale." A large part of this education consists in the knowledge of moral virtues, as indicated by the ancients:

By the time that the childe do com to xvii yeres of age, to the intent his courage be bridled with reason, hit were nedefull to rede unto hym some warkes of philosophie . . . [Especially], there wolde be radde to hym for an introduction, two the fyrst bokes of the worke of Aristotell called *Ethicæ*, wherein is contained the definitions and propre significations of every vertue.¹

And the study of "moral virtues" became in fact so popular that we find traces of it in the most unexpected places: in W. Bullein's *Dialogue against the fever Pestilence*, for example, where the sick man Antonius talks reason with his physician, in order apparently to go to sleep. The learned doctor informs his patient that there are intellectual and moral virtues (a distinction derived from Aristotle). The moral sort "is the mother of many good thynges, as chastitie, liberalitie, humanitie and good manners."² Here, it may be remarked, one of Spenser's virtues, Chastity, appears with the exact name he gives it.

In Italy, among numerous treatises, one of the most notable and famous was the one originally published at Venice in 1542, by Alessandro Piccolomini, who became later archbishop of

¹ *The Boke named the Governour* (1531), Book I, chap. xi (ed. Croft, 1883, Vol. I, p. 91). Elyot deals in it with a considerable number of virtues or qualities, beginning with Majesty and Nobilitie, to continue with Affabilitie, Placabilitie, Mercy, Humanytie, Benevolence, Liberalitie, Amitie, Justice, Faith (in the sense of loyalty), Fortitude, Patience, Magnanimitie, Abstinence, Constance, Temperance, Sobrietie, Sapience. In the *Day-booke of John Dorne, bookseller in Oxford, A.D. 1520*, Aristotle appears several times, and among the works of his sold by Dorne we find his *Ethics*, translated by J. Argyropoulou, several copies of which are disposed of in that year. (*Collectanea*, ed. Fowler, Oxford Historical Society, 1885.)

² First edition, 1564; reprinted by M. W. Bullen and A. H. Bullen (Early English Text Society, 1888).

Patras and coadjutor archbishop of Sienna. Its very title shows that the author had assigned to himself, in almost the same words, the same moral task as Spenser: *Della Istituzione morale di tutta la vita dell' uomo nato nobile e in citta libera*. Piccolomini pays, of course, special attention to moral virtues; he takes Aristotle for his guide, and concludes that, according to this master, there are eleven of them: "l'undeci virtù morali che pone Aristotele;"¹ or, in English: "the eleven morall vertues as Aristotile hath devised"—the very words of Spenser, except that there are eleven virtues, not twelve.

But twelve was a kind of sacred number (the twelve months of the year, tribes of Israel, apostles, Cæsars, books of Virgil, etc.), and was sure to come in. In his revised edition of 1560, Piccolomini inserted a phrase in which he states that one more virtue, Prudence, might reasonably be added to the others. I have, it is true, says he, placed prudence among intellectual habits, "quantunque ancor' ella in un certo modo si possa dir morale."² This was enough in any case: the fatidical number twelve was within reach; to be eventually accepted the more willingly by a poet like Spenser, as it allowed him to give his epic the same number of books as the *Æneis*.

Piccolomini's work had a considerable success; it had Italian editions in 1543, 1545, 1552, 1560, etc.; it was translated into French: *L'Institution morale du Seigneur Alexandre Piccolomini, mise en françois par Pierre de Larivey, Champenois* (Paris, 1581, 8vo). Larivey follows the edition of 1560, which allows him to state that there are "unze vertus morales," plus Prudence, total twelve; but no more than his original does he mention expressly this number.

That this same *Istituzione Morale* was known to Spenser we have positive testimony. The poet's life in Ireland had begun in August, 1580. Whether or not he had met before, he certainly knew there, and had for one of his chief literary friends

¹ Book IV, chap. 2 (fol. 74): "Del numero de le virtù morali e del soggetto di quello."

² Book V, chap. 3, ed. of Venice, 1560, p. 185 (corresponding to Book IV, chap. 2, of the ed. of 1542). The addition was borrowed, however, not from Aristotle, but from Plato, whose four main virtues, adopted and popularized by Cicero (*De Officiis*, Book I, chap. 5), were Prudence, Justice, Courage (or Strength of Mind), and Temperance. Two of these four are on Spenser's list.

Lodowick Bryskett, of Italian origin as it seems, a companion of Sir Philip Sidney in his travels, who had in 1577 been appointed clerk of the chancery in Ireland. Promoted afterward to higher functions, he had Spenser for his successor.

Many years later, long after the poet's death, Bryskett published a book, apparently composed during the earliest period of Spenser's stay in Ireland, and entitled *A Discourse of civill Life: containing the Ethike part of morall Philosophie* (London, 1606). The author dedicated to Robert, earl of Salisbury, "this booke treating of the morall vertues," and stated further that the work had been originally "written to the Rt. Hon. Arthur, late lord Grey of Wilton," Spenser's first chief and patron in Ireland. It was a dialogue, having the same object as Piccolomini's prose and Spenser's verse, namely, "to frame a gentleman fit for civill conversation and to set him in the direct way that leadeth him to his civill felicitie." The occasion, a less poetical one than the "annuall feaste" of the *Faerie Queene*, was that Bryskett had, as he tells us, taken medicine; his friends came to see how he did, visiting him in his "little cottage which [he] had newly built neare unto Dublin." These friends were the primate of Armagh, the queen's solicitor, several captains, Spenser himself; last, not least, "Th. Smith, Apothecary," the prime cause and true "begetter" of the dialogue.

What follows immediately is well known; no one fails to remember how, after some talk on medicines and their effect, the interlocutors begin to discuss the principles of moral philosophy. Bryskett, as a man who had had previous conversations on the subject with Spenser, appeals point blank to him: "Shew your selfe courteous now unto us all," and let us listen to what you have to say on moral virtues. Spenser declines; he has already "undertaken a work tending to the same effect which is . . . under the title of á *Faerie Queene*, to represent all the morall vertues." Better wait for that work, and rather let Bryskett himself speak, as he had translated what "Giraldi" wrote on the subject. All agree, not without expressing "an extreme longing after [Spenser's] worke of the *Faerie Queene*, whereof some parcels had bin by some of them seene."

Bryskett consents, therefore, to be the orator of the day, and, having before his eyes the manuscript of his translation of Giraldi Cinthio's three dialogues, *Dell' allevare et ammaestrare i figliuoli nella vita civile*,¹ gives an account of the best way to rear children so that they become virtuous and model citizens. Reaching, however, the question of the moral virtues, Bryskett declares that Cinthio has treated them "somewhat too briefly and confusedly. I have therefore, to helpe mine owne understanding, had recourse to Piccolomini." Following these two Italians, and borrowing through them ideas from Plato as well as from Aristotle, he draws up a formal list of twelve virtues, the number being then expressly mentioned, the first four and chief ones being, as a matter of fact, the four Platonistic ones:

There are then by the generall consent of men foure principall vertues appertaining to civill life, which are Fortitude, Temperance, Justice and Prudence; from which four are also derived (as branches from their trees) sundry others to make up the number of twelve, and they are these ensuing, Liberalitie, Magnificence, Magnanimitie, Mansuetude, Desire of Honor, Veritie, Affability and Urbanitie.

From such books and such conversations, from other less solemn talks which he and Bryskett, interested in the same problems, could not fail to have, Spenser derived his list of virtues and his ideas regarding a list of twelve. These ideas apparently matured little by little. His poem, as we know by his letter to Harvey of April, 1580, was then already begun; but most probably the general and dogmatic plan of it, as it appeared later in the letter to Raleigh, was not yet settled in his mind. He mentions, in any case, in his epistle to Harvey, his *Epithalamion Thamesis* as a separate poem, unwritten yet, and which will be in quantitative verse: "whyche Booke I dare undertake wil be very profitable for the knowledge and rare for the invention and manner of handling." But this *Epithalamion*, only projected in 1580, was to be written in Spenser's own stanza and to form part of his great poem, filling the eleventh canto of Book IV.

The letter to Raleigh, explaining the then completely elaborated plan of the author, was written only ten years later, some

¹Originally published at the beginning of the second volume of the *Hecatomithi* (Monte Regale, 1565).

six years after the meeting described by Bryskett. That it does not cover exactly the facts is no wonder. That Spenser knew something of Aristotle, and that some of the maxims and ideas of the great philosopher remained in his mind, cannot be doubted. Either through direct or indirect borrowings, he took from him his notion of the middle or virtuous state, standing between two faulty extremes (though he did not try, as Aristotle did, to apply this theory to every virtue¹). From him, too, he derived the opinion that the political and the moral virtues can be united sometimes in a single man; and he intended to show it in composing later another poem, in which Arthur would have been represented as possessing all "the polliticke vertues . . . after that hee came to be king." Who, says Aristotle, will be able to unite in himself this double series of virtues, the private and the public ones? "I have already said it: the magistrate (τὸν ἀρχοντα) worthy of his functions."²

But with these ideas, many others from various sources, of less dignified origin, were associated. A dignified origin ever was in the wishes and tastes of Spenser. Writing under his eyes, E. K. had annotated the *Shepherd's Calendar*, and, pointing out the poet's originals, quoted, we know, much more willingly Theocritus than Mantuan, and Mantuan than Marot. To Marot, Spenser owes most, and he is the one spoken of least. Is he even "worthy of the name of a poete?" asks supercilious E. K., who, when he comes to the twelfth Eclogue, adapted, and in part closely translated, from the French, does not even mention the name of Marot. In the same way, owing to this same disposition, Spenser, wanting to expound the purport of his great work, clung with particular pleasure to the arch-philosopher Aristotle, and referred the reader to his "twelve private morall vertues"—a mere afterthought, probably, imagined after part of the poem had been written; for Spenser begins with the virtue of Holiness, conspicuously absent, as we saw, from Aristotle's enumeration, but praised in many other ancient or modern treatises, in La Primaudaye, for example,

¹ It is only incidentally dwelt upon, forming the episode of Guyon's visit to Medina (Book II, c. 2).

² *Politics*, Book III, chap. 2.

well known in England, and who himself derived his inspiration from Plato:

La sapience éternelle, par l'opération de son esprit, conduit et eslève la contemplative à sa propre fin, qui est l'heureuse science immuable concernant le service deu à la majesté divine, et que Socrate appelloit Religion et très grande vertu, disant . . . que nul ne se devoit persuader de pouvoir trouver parmi le genre humain une plus grande vertu que la religion et piété envers Dieu.¹

It should be noted, moreover, that, express though Spenser's statement be concerning the twelve virtues, signs are not lacking that his remembrance of Aristotle was somewhat vague. He must have felt it himself, for it occurs to him once to refer, in rather loose fashion, to "Aristotle and the rest," saying: "In the person of Arthur, I sette forth magnificence in particular, which vertue for that (according to Aristotle and the rest) it is the perfection of all the rest, and containeth in it them all." He follows here, as a matter of fact, neither Aristotle nor the rest; he seems to have confounded Magnificence (*μεγαλοπρέπεια*) with Magnanimity (*μεγαλοψυχία*), and Magnanimity with Justice; for of Magnanimity Aristotle says that it is a kind of ornament applicable to all the other virtues; while in his chapter on Justice he recalls the saying, proverbial in his day: "All virtue is contained in Justice."

To sum up: Spenser owes something to Aristotle, but far less than he led us to believe. Here, as elsewhere, to the exalted models whom he quotes, different ones, of lesser stature, must be added. He borrowed as much from such moderns as Piccolomini and Bryskett as from Aristotle. We must be careful, to be sure, not to pass too severe a judgment on him for that; the notions then prevalent about borrowing, imitating, and referring to sources were very different from ours. But the fact just pointed out is a fact, and must be kept in remembrance. Taking Spenser at his word, more than one commentator has connected too exclusively the poet with the grandest models. But much is to be sought for

¹ *Académie Française, en laquelle est traité de l'institution des mœurs et de ce qui concerne le bien et heureusement vivre en tous les estats et conditions*, 1st ed., 1577: a dialogue, which the author affirms to have really taken place between "quelques jeunes gentils-hommes angevins mes compaignons." The third volume, published separately later, was dedicated to Elizabeth. I quote from the edition of 1598, Vol. I, fol. 25.

outside of them; much remains to be done, much more than I have attempted in this preliminary essay; much to show, for example, the quantity of notions derived neither from Tasso nor from Ariosto, in the course of Spenser's great work, but from the very same romances of chivalry which troubled Don Quixote's brain and later enchanted Edmund Burke's mind: the *Espejo de Principes*, for example, that same *Mirror of Knighthood* in which shone the "dear Lindabrides" derided—and made famous—by Ben Jonson.

J. J. JUSSERAND.

INDO-EUROPEAN *I* AND *E* IN GERMANIC

During the first half of the nineteenth century comparative philology was dominated, as is well known, by the belief in the primitive character of the Sanskrit, and especially of the Sanskrit vowels. As this language exhibited only the simple vowels *a*, *i*, *u*, these were assumed to be original, and the *e* and *o* of the European languages to be derived from them. Since now the Gothic vowel system agreed remarkably with the Sanskrit, it was but natural to assume that it also represented the original state of affairs. In fact, Grimm saw in this agreement of the Gothic with the Sanskrit the strongest possible proof of the original character of the latter.¹ Under such a belief, it is clear that the only way to account for *e* and *o* of the West and North Germanic was to explain them, as Grimm did as breakings of *i* and *u*.

Gradually, however, doubts as to the secondary character of *e* and *o* began to multiply. Curtius struck the first blow at this theory in his famous article *Über die Spaltung des A-Lautes im Griechischen und Lateinischen* and finally, under the repeated assaults of Amelung, Collitz, and Joh. Schmidt, the whole structure of comparative philology, based as it was upon Sanskrit, fell with a crash, and philologists were forced to erect on new foundations a new structure from the ruins of the old. As Collitz clearly showed,² the original Indo-European vowels must be considered identical with those of the Greco-European, as he put it, and not with the Sanskrit. With the old structure there fell also the belief in the primitive character of the Gothic. Germanic philology had likewise to be revised; and when the smoke of battle had cleared away, it was seen that W. Germ. had forged to the front, while Gothic had been relegated to second place. It was now only natural to assume, for example, that the *e* of Lat. *edere* had

¹ In his *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*, p. 274, Grimm says: "Es ist ein gewaltiger Satz, den uns Sanskrit und gotische Sprache zur Schau tragen, dass es ursprünglich nur drei kurze Vokale gibt, *a*, *i*, *u*."

² *Bezz. Beiträge*, Vol. II, p. 303, and Vol. III, pp. 177 ff.

been retained in ON *eta*, OE, OS *etan*, OHG *ezzan*, and that the *i* of Goth. *itan* was a secondary development.

The only disturbing element was the fact that the parallelism between *i* and *u* had been broken up. Under the old theory both were considered original, as we have seen, and both were similarly broken, the one to *e*, the other to *o*. According to the new view, however, *u* still retained its old position, because, Indo-Eur. *o* having become *a* in Germanic, Prim. Germ. could not have had a short *o*. *U* was therefore still considered original, while W. Germ. *o* had still to be explained as a breaking of *u*. With *e* it was different, for it was shown in the majority of cases to be a survival of Indo-Eur. *e*, and not a breaking. There were, to be sure, some few instances where Indo-Eur. *i* had clearly been broken to *e* in W. Germ., but the old parallelism between *i* and *u* was evidently a thing of the past.

Now, it is possible that some of the older philologists may have had at times the desire to restore this parallelism, and to reinstate Gothic once more in its old supremacy; but the matter seemed impossible of accomplishment. Suddenly, however, Professor Collitz appeared at the Philologian Congress held at St. Louis during the Louisiana Purchase Exposition, and, in Vol. XX, pp. 65 ff., of the *Modern Language Notes*, with a theory which aims at just this restoration. In his article he takes the ground that Indo-Eur. accented *e* becomes *i* in Prim. Germ., irrespective of the vowels which follow, and that then this *i* is later broken to *e* before *a*, *o*, *e* in N. and W. Germ., but remains unaltered in Gothic.¹ This is virtually a return to the position of Jacob Grimm, as far as Gothic is concerned, and is all the stranger when one remembers that Professor Collitz was one of the first to abandon Grimm's position.² The matter is now, however, no longer as simple as at the time of Grimm, who, under the belief in the originality of the Sanskrit vowels, merely had to assume the retention

¹ Except, of course, when broken before *r*, *h*, *hv*.

² In his article, *Bezz. Beiträge*, Vol. III, p. 177, he clearly sides with Møllenhoff against Grimm, stating that one of the supports of Grimm's theory had been withdrawn, since Møllenhoff had recognized that the three-vowel system of the Gothic goes back to a general Germanic five-vowel system, as Gothic *i* and *u* do not represent the earlier stages of the *e* and *o* of the other Germanic dialects.

of original *i* in Gothic. Under the present views, Professor Collitz is forced to assume a two-fold change. For the sake of clearness, let us state the case concretely. To explain the difference between OHG *ezzan* and *izzit*, or between OHG *wint* (Lat. *ventus*) and *zehan* (Lat. *decem*), we must assume either one of two things. Either Indo-Eur. *e* has remained *e* in Germanic in accented syllables except before nasal + cons., or when followed by *i* or *j*, or we must assume, with Professor Collitz, that Indo-Eur. *e* became *i* in all cases in Prim. Germ., and was then broken to *e* before guttural vowels.

Now, it is a generally accepted rule of science that of two possible theories one should accept the simpler, other things of course being equal. Applying this principle to the case in hand, it would seem more natural, providing we knew nothing of the merits of the case, to suppose that Indo-Eur. *e* remained in Germanic except in certain specific cases, than to assume that it first changed to *i* and then in a vast majority of instances back again to *e*.¹ But let us admit, for the sake of argument, that the change which Professor Collitz assumes did really take place. Then the question naturally arises: When did it occur? At the time of Tacitus the original *e* is still retained, as such names as *Segimērus*, *Segimundus*, *Hermiones*, *Fenni*, and *Venedi*, over against OHG *Sigimar*, *Sigimund*, *Irmin-sūl*, *Winida*, go to prove.² This is the only possible interpretation; for, as the words have *i* in the second syllable, they could not be considered cases of breaking. Professor Collitz' twofold change must therefore have taken place later than the first century, A. D.

Now, by the side of these words with *e* there are to be found others with *i* before a nasal + cons.; e. g., *Ingræcones* and *Inguiomērus*. How would Professor Collitz explain the existence of the two vowels side by side, if Indo-Eur. *e* becomes *i* in all cases? The only natural explanation is that the change of *e* to *i* had already taken place before nasal + cons. in the first

¹ For example, in the verbs of the third ablaut class whose stems end in a liquid + cons. there are but four forms where *i* appears, namely in the three persons of the present sing. ind. and the sing. imp., whereas in all other present forms of the verb, the infinitive, the plural ind., and the whole of the subj. *e* is found.

² Cf. Bremer, *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, Vol. XXII, p. 251.

century, but not before double nasals or other consonants. All the evidence gathered goes to show that the change from Indo-Eur. *e* to *i* did not take place in Prim. Germ., as his theory would require, but that it was a separate dialectical development, and a late one at that. In continental German it seems to have taken place by the second century before double nasals, if stress can be laid on the spelling *Φίλννοι* in Ptolemy, and by the fourth century before other consonants when followed by an *i*, as the form *Sigismundus* of Ammianus Marcellinus would indicate. In N. Ger. the change appears to be much later, as the Finnish loan word *rengas* ("ring"), borrowed from the Norse and the Icelandic genitive *Venþa*,¹ would go to prove. Before other consonants the change does not seem to have occurred in ON before 600, as the Runic form *erilaR* ("earl") found in the inscriptions of Kragehul, Lindholm, and Varnum, etc., would seem to indicate.² In fact, Kock goes so far as to consider that the change had not taken place in some parts before the ninth century, basing his belief on the Celtic loan-word *erell*, which appears in the Irish annals of 847, and which is the borrowing of the above-mentioned *erilaR*.

The change of *e* to *i* in the combination *eu* was also very late. That it was unchanged in Prim. Germ. is shown by such words as *Teutomērus* and the Finnish *keula* (ON *kióll*). In Runic inscriptions we still have *eu* in *leubaR* ("dear"), *leub-wini*, etc. Further, in OE *treu-lēsnis* "perfidia," of the *Epinal Glossary*, and in OS *treulos* and *treuhaft*.³ How could Professor Collitz account, according to his theory, for the existence of *e* at so late a date? It is certainly not a breaking of *i* to *e*, for *u* never produces that result. It can only be explained as a retention of original *e*, which is, however, directly opposed to Professor Collitz' theory. Similarly, how shall we explain the occurrence of *e* before *u* of the following syllable in many words? In OE and ON we have in all such cases a breaking, which, however, goes back to an *e*.⁴ In OS the cases with *e* far outnumber those with *i*.⁵ Only in

¹ Cf. Kock, *Beiträge*, Vol. XXVII, p. 169.

² Cf. Bugge, *Arkiv for nordisk Filologi*, N. F., Vol. IV, p. 9.

³ Other examples, Streitberg, *op. cit.* § 62.

⁴ E. g., OE *feolu*, *teoru*, *felu*, *heoru*, etc.; ON *fiol*, *hiqrr*, *miolk*, etc.

⁵ Cf. Holthausen, *Altäussisches Elementarbuch*, § 82.

OHG does *i* appear to any great extent before *u*, and even here the cases are very evenly divided.¹ What possible explanation could Professor Collitz offer here? He could not assume that *u* had caused the breaking, for the numerous preterite plurals of the first ablaut class disprove this,² and we are accustomed to believe that *u* causes the retention of an original *i*. To my mind, we have here a clear tendency of continental German (i. e., OHG and OS) to change *e* to *i* before following *u*—a tendency, however, which was not consistently carried out, and which did not exist at all in OE and ON.³

Professor Collitz is forced to the assumption that Indo-Eur. *e* became *i* in Germanic in all positions, because he accepts Holtzmann's law that *i* and *u* are broken to *u* and *o* before *a*, *e* and *o*. This law still finds general acceptance for *u*, because it is so consistently carried out in the ablaut verbs in the second and third classes. But even here ON exhibits a few exceptions in the second class, e. g., the perfect participles *budinn* and *hlutenn* by the side of the regular *boðenn* and *hlotenn*.⁴ In the case of nouns the usage in the different Germanic dialects is very much divided with the exception of OHG.⁵ For OE Sievers⁶ points out the fact that when *u* is found a labial of some sort is present, and the same would apply to most of the OS examples. Might not the instances with *u* be considered as a survival of the original vowel, which the labials by their related character helped to retain, as is still the case in English *pull*, *bush* etc?

If, now, the breaking of *u* to *o* admits of numerous exceptions, that of *i* to *e* exhibits so many instances of nonconformity that one may reasonably doubt whether it really exists at all. Heinzel⁷

¹ Cf. Braune, *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, § 30c.

² E. g., ON *biton*, OE *biton*, OS *bitum*, OHG *bizzum*, where *i* appears without exception.

³ The cases in the 1st sing. pres. ind. of the strong verbs in ON are explained by Noreen as due to analogy.

⁴ Noreen, *Altisländische Grammatik* § 412, an. 2.

⁵ Cf. OE *fugol*, OS *fugol*, and even OHG *fugal*, by the side of the more usual *formfogal*, or OE *bucca*, ON *bukkr*, by the side of OHG *boc*, ON *bokkr*. In OE the exceptions are especially frequent. In addition to those already mentioned we find: *full*, *wulf*, *wulle*, *fugol*, *bucca*, *cnucian*, *ufian*, *ufor*, *ufera*, *lufu*, *lufian*, *spura* (beside *spora*) *spurnan*, (beside *spornan*) *murnan*, *murnian*, *furdor*, *furdum*. Similarly in OS: *ful*, *wulf*, *smultro* (OE *smolt*), *turf*, *huret* (NHG *Horst*), *spurnan*, *fugal*, *juk*, *kluflok* (NHG *Knoblauch*), *uppa* (Holthausen, loc. cit., § 88).

⁶ *Altenglische Grammatik*, § 55.

⁷ *Geschichte der neufränkischen Geschäftssprache*, p. 46.

believed that original *i* remained in OHG in accented syllables, while acknowledging the existence of a number of exceptions, a list of which he gives. Paul¹ was of the opinion that *i* remained in Prim. Germ., but was changed in OHG at times to *e* before *a, e, o*. Braune² denies the existence of the breaking as a law, stating that Germ. *i* remains as a rule in OHG even before following *a, e, o*. Wilmanns³ likewise is inclined to doubt whether the law exists at all. Of late, however, there has been a tendency to refer the breaking back to an earlier period. Streitberg⁴ states that before $\bar{a}, \bar{o}, \bar{ae}$ of the following syllable *i* is broken to *e* in Prim. Germ., if *j* or nasal + cons. do not intervene, and thinks that the original state of affairs was disturbed by numerous cases of analogy. Brugmann, who in the first edition of his *Grundriss* had denied its existence for Prim. Germ., now follows Streitberg, but is less positive, stating that if it is a mechanical sound-change, it probably belongs to Prim. Germ.⁵ The reason of this change of view is due to the few cases in which general Germ. *e* undoubtedly corresponds to Indo-Eur. *i*; e. g.: OE, OS, OHG *wer*, OA *verr*, over against Lat. *vir*; OE, OHG, MLG *nest*, but Lat. *nidus* < **nizdos*; ON *hegre*, MLG *heger*, OHG *hehera* (NHG *Häher*), but Skr. *kikiś*, Grk. *κίσσα*.⁶ These instances appearing in every dialect, the conclusion was natural that the change of *i* to *e* was general Germanic. This is undoubtedly true for the words in question, but are we justified in connecting this breaking with the one observed in OHG? Kluge is the only one, as far as I know, to attempt to formulate any more detailed theory for this change, which he acknowledges to be rare.⁷ The truth of the matter is that we do not know the conditions under which the change takes place, as Kluge himself confesses. The

¹ *Beiträge*, Vol. VI, p. 82.

² *Althochdeutsche Grammatik*, § 31.

³ *Deutsche Grammatik*, § 181.

⁴ *Urgermanische Grammatik*, § 68.

⁵ Cf. *Grundriss*, Vol. I¹, § 35, and Vol. I², § 86.

⁶ A full list is given by Noreen, *Abriss der urgermanischen Lautlehre*, p. 20.

⁷ In Paul's *Grundriss*, Vol. I², p. 410, he considers it to be the rule before *r*, as in OE, OS, OHG, *wer*, ON *verr*, Lat. *vir*; before *h*, as in OE *tweho*, OHG *zweho*; and before *s*, as in OE, OHG *nest*. Before other consonants the dialects differ; thus, OE *higora* by the side of ON *hegre*, etc., given above, and ON *stega*, OHG *stega*, *steg*, but ON *stige* and *stigr*.

instances before *r* and *h* would seem to indicate that it is not dependent on the following vowel, but on the consonant, and might be considered parallel to the Gothic breakings. The other cases are too few in number, and the evidence too contrary, to make it safe to state the rule for Prim. Germ. as positively as Streitberg does. As to analogy, it is just as reasonable to suppose that it caused the change of *i* to *e* in other cases than before *h* and *r*, as to believe, with Brugmann, that later analogies interfered with the working of the law.

The exceptions to the law are very numerous and of great weight. Especially is this true of the many verbs of the first ablaut class. Phonetic laws, if they work at all, are found to be carried out most consistently in the case of the strong verbs. The strongest proof for the breaking of *u* to *o* is drawn from the perfect participles of the second and third classes. In the case of *i*, however, this is just where the rule breaks down. Over against the great number of participles of the first class in all dialects with *i* before the *a* of the ending, we have but one solitary instance of conformity to the law, namely ON *bedenn*, ppl. of *biða*. In my opinion, the older views were correct, and the breaking of *i* to *e* before *a*, *e*, and *o* exists as a tendency in the main only in OHG. Most of the examples generally adduced in support of the law are taken from this dialect. Here, indeed, we find many doublets, such as *scif*—*scef*; *scirm*—*scerm*; *ledic*—*lidic*, and many cases of *e* where other languages have *i*.¹ In loan-words the usage is divided in OHG, as Wilmanns points out.² Furthermore, if the breaking of *i* to *e* is so general a rule as many would have us believe, and as Professor Collitz evidently assumes, how can we explain the persistence of Indo-Eur. *i* in such words as OE, OHG *fisk*, ON *fiskr*, OS *fisc* (stem *fisko*—) or in OHG *wisa*, *snita*, *wizzôd*, and *hlinên*? Since the stems of all these words end in one of the above mentioned vowels, we should expect the *i* to be broken to *e*, as no hindering consonant intervenes. Is it reasonable to believe in a rule where the testimony is so divided, and

¹ E. g., *queck*, but OE *cwic*: *zebar*, but OE *tifer*: *lebara*, but OE *lifer*. See list in Braune, *op. cit.*, § 31, an. 1, and Wilmanns, *op. cit.*, § 181.

² E. g. *tihlôn* (Lat. *dictare*), *tisc*. (Lat. *discus*), *phistor* (Lat. *pistor*), with *i*, but *bech* (Lat. *pix*), *pfeffer* (Lat. *piper*), with *e*, and *messa* by the side of *missa* (Lat. *missa*).

the exceptions more numerous than the instances adduced in its support?

If, however, we write our *non liquet* above it and discard the rule, we shall have no difficulty in explaining the vowels of the past participles of the ablaut verbs. In the case of the verbs of the first class,¹ we simply have to assume that the original *i* has been retained even before the *a* of the ending, and we meet with no difficulty. All the evidence is of the same kind and without exception, apart from the isolated Norse form *bedenn* mentioned above. Similarly, in the fifth class² we need merely to suppose that the Indo-Eur. *e* has remained, and again the matter is simple, the evidence all in harmony, and we are obliged to resort to no complicated system to explain the *e* of the root.

Let us see, however, what difficulties Professor Collitz has created for himself by considering the Gothic vowels to be original, and by accepting Holtzmann's rule of breaking. In order to explain the vowel of OHG *gigeban*, he has to assume a double change, first of *e* to *i* in accordance with Gothic *gibans*, and then a subsequent breaking in W. and N. Germ. back to the original *e*. But this rule, which works well for verbs of the fifth class, does not hold good for those of the first; for here we find, e. g., OHG *gibizzan* instead of *gibezzan*, which the rule would lead us to expect. To meet this difficulty, Professor Collitz creates a new law, and states that the breaking in the past participles is dependent upon that of the present stem. The verbs of the first class having an *i* in the present, which is not subject to breaking, therefore the vowel of the past participle likewise remains unbroken. This rule seems at first sight to be very satisfactory, for it accounts not only for the verbs of the first class, but also for those of the second and third classes, as Professor Collitz' examples show. In OHG it also accounts for those of the fourth class, but does not explain the forms of *neman* in the other dialects. In OE, to be sure, where *i* and *u* appear regularly before simple nasals, we have correctly enough inf. *niman*, participle *numen*. In OS, however, where the most usual form for

¹ E. g., OHG *gizigan* and *gibizzan*.

² E. g., OHG *gigeban*, *gibetan*.

the present is *niman*,¹ the past participle exhibits most frequently the vowel *o*, rarely *u*,² which is directly opposed to Professor Collitz' rule of the dependence of the participle on the present stem. Similarly, in ON, although we have the infinitive *nema*, we find the form *numenn* to be more frequent in the participle than *nomenn*, which the rule of breaking would lead us to expect.³

There is, however, a much more serious class of exceptions to Professor Collitz' rule, and one which suggested itself to his mind; namely, the so-called *j*-presents of the fifth class,⁴ whose past participles exhibit the vowel *e*, and not that of the present stem, contrary to his rule of dependence. Professor Collitz very cleverly met and avoided this difficulty by changing his rule to read, that when the preterit plural and the past participle had one and the same breakable vowel in Prim. Germ., the breaking only occurs in the past participle when the vowel of the present stem is broken; otherwise it remains unbroken through the influence of the vowel of the preterit plural. This sur le certainly ingenious, but is so complicated that it is pot eno suspicion. Moreover, it is wholly empirical. We are not told why the influence should be so strong in certain cases and not in others. If, as Professor Collitz assumes, the *e* of the present stem exercises such an influence over the vowel of the past participle in the first, second, and third classes, in spite of the vowel of the preterit plural, which by its resemblance would naturally tend to keep the vowel unchanged, then why should not the umlauted vowel *i* of the *j*-presents exert a still more powerful influence over the vowel of the past participle, when the form of the preterit plural is so different as not to be a disturbing factor? In other words, if *u* is broken to *o* in OHG *giworfan*, in dependence upon the *e* of *werfan*, in spite of the *u* of the preterit

¹ *Neman* occurs sporadically in the MSS M, C, P of the *Heliland*, and in the *Essen Glosses*; see Holthausen, *op. cit.* § 83.

² Holthausen, *op. cit.*, § 438 an.

³ Also in the Norse verbs *suimma*, where *i* appears regularly before the double nasal, Noreen considers the original form of the past participle to have been **somenn*, and only later to have changed by analogy to *sumenn* (*Altisländische Grammatik*, § 423, an. 2). Here the form of the vowel is evidently controlled by the double or single nasal, and not by the breaking or non-breaking of the vowel of the present stem.

⁴ Such as OHG *bitten*, *sitzen*, etc.

wurfum, why should not the *i* of *bitten* cause the past participle to appear as *gibitan*, notwithstanding the *a* of the ending, when the preterit *bātum* is so different in form that it cannot possibly be a disturbing factor? These complicated rules, however, are not necessary, as we have seen, if we are willing to assume the secondary character of the Gothic vowels.

In conclusion, I fail to see that we have to resort to complicated theories to explain the vocalism of Gothic under the generally accepted view, as Professor Collitz charges. Gothic has a strong predilection for close, or narrow, vowels. All the changes it makes are in this direction. Not only in the case of *i* and *u* does it show such preference, but also in the change of Germ. *ê* to *ē*, the close character of which is abundantly proved by the frequent substitution of *ei* for *ē*. Similarly, we find *û* often written for *ô*.¹ This tendency is characteristic, not only of Bible Gothic, but of all the Gothic dialects, as the instances collected by Wrede for East Gothic and Vandalian² and the Crimean Gothic forms *mīna* (= Bible Goth. *mēna*, OHG *māno*) and *schlīpan* (= Bible Goth. *slēpan*, OS *slāpan*) all go to show. The only exceptions to this tendency are the well known breakings before *h*, *hv*, and *r*, which are confessedly secondary. In my opinion, the attempt of Professor Collitz to derive the West and North Germanic vowels from the Gothic requires the assistance of a much more ingenious and complicated rule than any now in use to explain the secondary character of the Gothic.

DANIEL B. SHUMWAY.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

¹ Cf. Braune, *Gotische Grammatik*, § 7a, an. 2; § 12, an. 1; Wrede, *Gotische Grammatik*, § 12; Hirt, *Beiträge*, Vol. XXI, p. 122.

² *Quellen und Forschungen*, Vol. LIX, p. 91, and Vol. LXVIII, pp. 58 and 161.

